

# The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A CATHOLIC QUARTERLY  
for Teachers and Students of History

Vol. XXI

May • 1943

No. 4

## SYMPOSIUM—

*Prerequisite to Peace*

*John F. Bannon*

*Russia and the Versailles Order*

*Ross J. S. Hoffman*

*Autonomy for Alsace-Lorraine*

*William H. Maehl*

*Why the League Failed*

*Samuel A. Johnson*

Editorial: Quadricentennial of Copernicus

Alphonse M. Schwitalla

## Book Reviews

*Old Man River* - - - - - D. A. Lord

*A History of Historical Writing* - J. F. Bannon

*Christian Crisis* - - - - - P. J. Holloran

and others

25 cents a Copy

\$1.00 a Year



## Philosophical Publications

### The Dictionary of Philosophy

**\$6.00** edited by Dagobert R. Runes. An invaluable reference book for the student of human cultural development, embracing all major schools of theories of philosophy, philosophy of law, religious philosophy, logic, epistemology, ethics, metaphysics, Chinese, Jewish and Hindu philosophy.

### Sociology of Law

**\$3.75** by Georges Gurvitch with a preface by Roscoe Pound. The first complete study of the problems of the sociology in all its aspects.

### Theism and Cosmology

**\$3.50** by John Laird. The Gifford Lectures given by the eminent British Philosopher.

### God Is My Fuehrer

**\$2.75** by Pastor Martin Niemoller. Being his last 28 sermons. With a preface by Thomas Mann.

### From Copernicus to Einstein

**\$2.00** by Hans Reichenbach. A simple but scientific history of the ideas and dis-

coveries that have led to the formulation of the theory of relativity.

### Who's Who in Philosophy

**\$4.50** edited by Dagobert D. Runes. The complete biographical and bibliographical directory of all living Anglo-American philosophers.

### Dictionary of World Literature

#### Criticism—Forms—Technique

**\$7.50** edited by J. T. Shipley with Henry S. Canby Andre Maurois, Lewis Mumford, Allen Tate, G. A. Borgese a.o.

### Buddhist and Hindu Thought

**\$1.75** by A. K. Coomaraswamy.

### Encyclopedia of Modern Education

**\$8.50** edited by N. H. Rivlin and H. Schueler. Advisory Board: Harold Benjamin, Francis M. Crowley, Frank N. Freeman, I. L. Kandel, William H. Kilpatrick, Paul Klapper, Edward L. Thorndike. Presenting comprehensive entries on the basic principles and practices in administration, curriculum, educational psychology, edu-

cational sociology, finance, mental hygiene, methods of teaching, philosophy, teacher education, etc.

### The Future of Religion

**\$2.50** by John Elof Boodin. Towards a better understanding of the religious life.

### Frontiers of Poetry

**\$2.50** by Jaques Maritain. Essays on Poetry and Painting.

### The Art of Preaching

**\$1.75** by Arthur Allen. A manual for the preacher by the eminent British clergyman.

### Twentieth Century Philosophy

#### Living Schools of Philosophy

**\$6.00** edited by Dagobert D. Runes. Papers by Marvin Farber, V. F. Lenzen, Bertrand Russell, Wm. P. Montague, Herbert Feigl, Douglas C. Macintosh, Jaques Maritain, Ralph Tyler Flewelling, Wilbur Long, Wilbur M. Urban, Richard Hoenigswald, John Dewey, Ralph B. Winn, A. C. Ewing and others.

## PHILOSOPHICAL LIBRARY

### PUBLISHERS

15 E. 40th St. New York, N. Y.

## ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY

### ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

*Includes the following Schools and Colleges and Affiliated Institutions*

#### CONSTITUENT SCHOOLS

College of Arts and Sciences.....	221 North Grand Blvd.
College of Arts and Sciences at Florissant.....	Florissant, Mo.
Graduate School.....	15 North Grand Blvd.
University College.....	15 North Grand Blvd.
School of Divinity.....	St. Mary's College, St. Marys, Kansas
School of Medicine.....	1402 S. Grand Blvd.
School of Law.....	3642 Lindell Blvd.
School of Philosophy and Science.....	3633 West Pine
School of Dentistry.....	3556 Caroline Street
School of Commerce and Finance.....	3674 Lindell Blvd.
School of Nursing.....	1325 S. Grand Blvd.
School of Social Work.....	207 North Grand Blvd.

#### THE CORPORATE COLLEGES

Fontbonne College.....	Wydown and Big Bend Blvds.
Maryville College.....	Meramec and Nebraska Avenues
Webster College.....	Lockwood Blvd., Webster Groves, Missouri
Notre Dame Junior College.....	Ripa Avenue, South Saint Louis
Saint Mary's Junior College.....	O'Fallon, Missouri

#### THE HOSPITALS

##### 1. UNIVERSITY HOSPITALS

- (a) St. Mary's Hospital.....Clayton and Bellevue Avenues
- (b) Firmin Desloge Hospital.....1325 South Grand Blvd.
- (c) Mt. St. Rose Sanatorium.....9101 South Broadway

##### 2. AFFILIATED HOSPITALS

- (a) Alexian Brothers' Hospital.....3933 South Broadway
- (b) St. Anthony's Hospital.....Grand Blvd. and Chippewa
- (c) St. John's Hospital.....307 South Euclid Avenue

##### 3. STAFF-RELATED HOSPITALS

- (a) St. Mary's Infirmary.....1536 Papin Street
- (b) St. Louis City Hospital, Unit I.....1515 Lafayette Ave.
- (c) Homer G. Phillips Hospital.....2601 Whittier
- (d) St. Louis City Sanitarium.....5300 Arsenal Street
- (e) St. Louis Isolation Hospital.....5600 Arsenal Street

#### AFFILIATED NURSING SCHOOLS

- (a) Alexian Brothers' Hospital School of Nursing.....3933 South Broadway
- (b) St. John's Hospital School of Nursing.....307 S. Euclid Ave.

#### THE OUT-PATIENT SERVICES

- 1. THE UNIVERSITY OUT-PATIENT DEPARTMENT  
Firmin Desloge Hospital.....1315 South Grand Boulevard
- 2. THE ASSOCIATED OUT-PATIENT DEPARTMENTS
  - (a) Alexian Brothers' Dispensary.....3933 South Broadway
  - (b) St. John's Dispensary.....4945 Audubon Avenue

#### THE STAFF-RELATED OUT-PATIENT DEPARTMENTS

- (a) City Dispensary.....1515 Lafayette Avenue
- (b) The Obstetric Dispensaries  
St. Louis Obstetrical Hospital Association  
St. Ann's Foundling Asylum
- (c) The Pre-Natal Clinics  
The Cass Avenue Clinic  
The Bethesda Dispensary

#### WHITE HOUSE

St. Louis House of Retreats—  
White House, Jefferson Barracks P. O., Missouri



# The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A CATHOLIC QUARTERLY

for Teachers and Students of History

Published quarterly in November, January, March and May by the Missouri Province Educational Institute, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo. Price: 25c a copy; \$1.00 a year. Entered as second-class matter January 7, 1932, at the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on January 20, 1933.

VOL. XXI

MAY, 1943

No. 4

## Table of Contents

PREREQUISITE TO PEACE . . . . .	JOHN F. BANNON . . . . .	75
RUSSIA AND THE VERSAILLES ORDER . . . . .	ROSS J. S. HOFFMAN . . . . .	77
EDITORIAL: QUADRICENTENNIAL OF COPERNICUS . . . . .	ALPHONSE M. SCHWITALLA . . . . .	79
AUTONOMY FOR ALSACE-LORRAINE . . . . .	WILLIAM H. MAEHL . . . . .	81
WHY THE LEAGUE FAILED . . . . .	SAMUEL A. JOHNSON . . . . .	83
ON USURY III . . . . .	JOHN E. CANTWELL . . . . .	90
RECENT BOOKS IN REVIEW . . . . .		95

THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN is indexed in the Catholic Magazine Index of *The Catholic Bookman* and *The Catholic Periodical Index*

## Prerequisite to Peace

John F. Bannon, S. J., Ph. D.

St. Louis University

**S**TARTLING as it may seem to affirm it, there are even advantages in the fact that the men of this generation have had to fight two "world wars." The war effort of the United States, in matter of general preparedness, of efficiency, and dispatch, has profited greatly by the mistakes of 1917-1918, an advantage surely. It is to be fondly hoped that the second peace will likewise profit by the sorry example of the various settlements which followed World War I. That it may, there is urgent need of much clear thinking on a multiplicity of problems to which faulty solutions have been brought in the past. For this reason *The Historical Bulletin* in its present number offers views on several of these thorny questions which will have to be handled across the peace table.

The gallant stand of Russia against Nazi totalitarianism will bring that nation very much into focus when the structure of the post-war world is built; hence, it is well to review something of her past achievements and disappointments at other peace tables. The valuable and economically complementary provinces of Alsace and Lorraine will raise a question to haunt the negotiators. Perhaps, solution lies in that proposed herein, in the creation of a new political unit, built upon the unity already given by Nature. And no consideration of the post-war world can be complete without a measure of attention being accorded the successor to the League of Nations.

However, above and beyond these considerations of fact, there are those of another order which must enter into post-war planning. The blame for the present conflict need not be laid wholly at the door of the Treaty of Versailles and other settlements of that vintage. Nor

even are the individuals who framed those treaties wholly to blame. One and other merely reflected the ideas and ideals of the world to which they attempted to bring peace. If blame there is, the world, particularly the Western world, must bear the major share. For a century and a half, at very least, our West had been traveling "off the beam"; crashes under such conditions surprise no one. It is unfortunate that the crash has had to be of world-war proportions to bring us back to our senses.

### *Need of a Common Basis*

There is one primary essential to lasting peace and, unless the world is willing to face that fact, its second peace will be as unsatisfactory as the settlements of 1919-1920. We have to recognize the need of a common basis in the admission of a common set of principles or values to which all parties, victors and vanquished, will adhere. In days gone by, before the West felt so completely self-sufficient, such a common ground did exist. In the place of God's law which it systematically rejected the modern world tried to substitute international law and mutual agreements. But we have found, time and again, that this common basis must be more than man-made protocols. Man-made laws are too easily broken, particularly since we have not been able to devise a man-made force sufficiently strong to punish offenders or a man-made sanction severe enough to frighten potential offenders. Pacts and promises, treaties and agreements can become but scraps of paper to men endowed with free will and determined to abuse this freedom in the blind pursuit of their own selfish ends and who, moreover, have the might to make their selfish desires prevail.



Only God and religion are big enough, broad enough to serve as this common ground. God's law and God's principles alone know no boundaries, stop before no racial barriers, are enmeshed in no national tradition; they alone have to cede before no selfish human interest or before no perverse human will. If we would know peace, then our world must go back beyond the French Revolution, beyond the so-called Enlightenment, and with our Christian forefathers admit the eternal verities which God has revealed to men—admit our creature status, admit both the possibility and the fact of revelation, admit the doctrine of God's providence, admit Original Sin, admit the Incarnation with its divine Christ and the salvific power of His death, and all the rest.

We need not reject the benefits which the material progress of the last century and a half has brought. We will be thankful for them but will be careful to put them to better use. Intellectually, we have the work of at very least a century and a half to unravel—that is, if we feel that our culture pattern is worth saving and worthy of completing. We must go back to catch up the red thread of Christianity which has been the West's one culture constant since the fourth century of our era. To be unwilling to go back and once again weave God and God's law into our world pattern is seriously to jeopardize the chances of its permanency.

*"Liberty, Equality, Fraternity"*

Lack of a sound and secure basis has made it impossible to realize the potential good in the ideals which "modern civilization" had set for itself. The French Revolution proclaimed the regime of Liberty, Equality, Fraternity; but very soon it became evident that no one of these had a chance of realization. The intellectual progenitor of the French Revolution, the Enlightenment, with its cult of Reason and Science, had convinced men that God was unnecessary and that religion, in the old traditional sense, was superfluous in the world of "progress" which it would make. The Western world was too quick to believe, with results which we see today.

In the post-Revolution world Liberalism set itself up as the guardian of Liberty. Freedom, not liberty, was Liberalism's goal—freedom from authority, freedom from law, from tradition, from supervision, soon freedom, even, from God and God's law. Under Liberalism's sway Liberty became an empty shibboleth. And things could not have been otherwise, for liberty is of God, licence of deluded creatures, human and angelic. Deny God and there is no reason why men should be free, for man has no claim to freedom save as a creature made to the image of a God who is free.

Equality fared just as badly as it fell under the sway of the prophets of False Democracy. Equality was no new, no modern idea. It was as old in the world's culture heritage as was Christianity. Equality of man is a non-sense, unless based on the concept of common creation by God and common redemption by the blood of His Divine Son, on the common end to which all men are equally destined. Extract the idea of God and religion from Equality, and from the true democracy which equality should beget, and man is thrown headlong into a maze of inequalities without number—in-equality of talent, of ability, of health and wealth, of

energy and character. Eliminate God, and why should men not talk of *Herrenvolk* and similar absurdities?

Fraternity! How completely Rugged Individualism perverted, warped, ruined that fine ideal! The nineteenth century canonized selfishness and called it by a pretty name. As Science with its convenient doctrine of evolution helped man to feel secure in the elimination of God as the first cause and last end, so again Science played man false when she taught him to apply to his dealings with fellowmen that doctrine of "the survival of the fittest." Rights became important to the exclusion of correlative duties; force became law. Philanthropy and humanitarianism would do for charity; and they were just as soulless as the non-religious base on which they were enshrined. The earlier West had found sound basis for Fraternity in our brotherhood with Christ; but the nineteenth century, under Reason's sway, proceeded to strip Christ of His divinity, which left no real foundation for brotherhood save in racial blood and national tradition, language, and ambition. For nationalism is, after all, nothing more than individualism applied on a broader plane, that of the racial or territorial or cultural group.

*The God of Science*

For a century and a half the world, and most especially the West, has been living a futile existence. When Western men felt that they could get along without God and Christianity, they wrote their own condemnation and predestined to utter failure their best hopes and highest ideals. Of course, this was not evident in those days when enthusiasm for the creed of "progress" made men both intellectually and emotionally dizzy. In fact, few enough Western men seemed to suspect the logical terminus of it all much before the outbreak of World War I. There was much to hold their more considered attention. Under the prodding of Science Nature began to yield up her secrets; and Invention turned this new knowledge into thousands of machines and gadgets, many of which made life so pleasant and so easy that only rarely did men find it necessary to carry their thoughts and aspirations beyond. Few thought in those halcyon days that this very knowledge of Nature and this same power of Invention might sometime be used to turn Nature's gifts and resources into horrible engines of destruction. Today, witnessing this all around us, we are almost minded to curse our knowledge and our inventiveness, for today we have come to realize for how little men count on the world's battlefields. Victory will come to him who produces the best, the fastest, the least vulnerable, the deadliest, the most machines, and, perhaps, the most destructive gases. That god of Science which men enshrined in the place of the Creator is today turning upon hapless men and pitiously crushing them and their civilization.

The modern age was busy creating wealth. But, forgetting that all men are brothers, it made no provision for fair distribution of that wealth in order that all men's lives might be bettered. All our wealth has done little more than divide men among themselves, engender wars, and raise up a proletariat whose inspiration is hate and whose weapons, force and revolution.

We glorified education. But that education was faulty

(Please turn to page ninety)



# Russia and the Versailles Order

Ross J. S. Hoffman, Ph. D.

*Fordham University  
New York City*

FOUR times in the last hundred and fifty years Russia has played a decisive part in restoring, preserving or arranging the state system and peace of Europe. The armies of Czar Alexander I, after absorbing the shock of Napoleon's invasion of Russia, followed the French imperialists into Poland and Germany, then over the Rhine and to Paris, where peace was dictated, the legitimate monarchy of France restored, and the first steps taken to resurrect the historic political constitution of Europe which had been subverted by French revolutionary imperialism. Again, in 1849, it was a Russian Czar, Nicholas I, who turned the scales against Magyar revolutionaries and the Greater Germany movement and saved the Austrian Empire, enabling that guardian of political conservatism and moderation to stand until 1914 as a barrier against the extreme ambitions of Pan-Germans. In the war of 1914-1918 it is not too much to say that Russia saved Europe from passing under the German yoke. The speed and force of the Grand Duke Nicholas' offensive on the eastern front in 1914 compelled the transfer of German divisions from Belgium and France; this probably saved Paris and enabled the western Allies to construct a defensible trench line from the North Sea to the Alps. In 1915 the Russians bore the brunt of German attack and gave the British the time needed to build a first-class army. Despite vast losses in men and territory Russia rose in 1916—it seemed as from the grave—and smote the Central Powers a blow that undoubtedly saved Italy from Austrian conquest and relieved the French in the blood bath at Verdun. In 1917, when weariness and defeatism were sweeping through the armies of Kerensky's short-lived republic, new Russian offensive action kept the Germans sufficiently engaged to prevent their concentration in the west before the arrival of large American forces on French soil. And even in 1918, when the Bolshevik government quit the war and entered upon a Machiavellian flirtation with the Central Powers, Russia struck mortal blows at Imperial Germany by communist propaganda and plotting. In the present war, all signs indicate that Russia has again made possible the overthrow of a continental tyranny. By sustaining almost the full force of the Nazi *Wehrmacht's* attack in 1941-42 the Soviet Republic enabled Britain and America to organize a world coalition, which points toward a new defeat for illegitimate German ambition.

## *Two Forgotten Truths*

Two political truths which statesmen can ignore only at the cost of inviting their own ruin are indicated by this record. One is that Russia,—a mighty, coherent political thing which cannot be destroyed,—will never suffer willingly the consolidation of the central and western European state system under a single master. The other is that without Russian aid the forces of national independence in Europe, even supported by the British Empire and the United States, are incapable of

checking German military power. These truths were either forgotten or ignored by the architects of the 1919 European settlement, and that fact was a prime reason why the settlement failed to endure.

When the Central Powers collapsed in 1918 the Russian state had disappeared, and the Russian land was a vast theater of civil war. The communist republic at Moscow, which urged the world to salute Lenin rather than Wilson as the prophet of the new order, was fighting for its life against anti-Bolshevik armies. These armies were receiving a measure of support from the Allied and Associated Powers: support that was a continuation of the aid extended to Russia before the Bolsheviks made the Brest-Litovsk treaty of peace with Germany (March 3, 1918). At that time a part of the Russian armies had refused to desert the Allied cause and the Supreme War Council at Paris decided to assist them in order to reconstruct an eastern front against the enemy and to prevent large supplies of war matériel (sent to Russia by way of Murmansk, Archangel and Vladivostok) from falling into German hands. This aid included the despatch of an expeditionary force of Japanese, American, British, French and Italian troops to Siberia, and the landing of another force, mainly British, in the White Sea region; while British imperial troops of the Middle East were in touch with anti-Bolshevik forces in the Caucasus and on the Caspian. After Turkey's capitulation Allied naval power was brought to bear against both Germans and Bolsheviks through the Black Sea. None of the Allied Powers was formally at war with the Moscow republic, for none had recognized it; but all feared Bolshevism,—because of the very nature of it and of the possibility that it might ally with the Germans,—and all were under the moral obligation of succoring their loyal Russian friends.

But they did not like the business. Their troops felt that the war was over and had little appetite for settling the affairs of Russia; they wanted to get out and go home. Much leftist and liberal opinion opposed giving support to the 'White' armies. The American government was very uneasy about the Siberian expedition, fearing the Japanese would exploit it in their own interests. Moreover, the Allies had declared in the Fourteen Points that Russia should settle her own affairs: "The evacuation (by the Germans) of all Russian territory and such a settlement of all questions affecting Russia as will secure the best and freest cooperation of the other nations of the world in obtaining for her an unhampered and unembarrassed opportunity for the independent determination of her own political development and national policy and assure her of a sincere welcome into the society of free nations under institutions of her own choosing."

That declaration had been made, however, in January, 1918, six weeks before the Russo-German peace. It had been framed with an eye to encouraging the Bolsheviks to remain in the war against the Central



Powers. Their refusal to go on fighting had altered the whole set of relations and obligations, and both political prudence and the dictates of honor required that support for the anti-Bolshevik armies be continued.

#### *Divided Counsels*

Another vital element in the Russian question had to do with the European frontiers of whatever new state emerged from the civil war. In the winter of 1917-1918 the Baltic peoples, recoiling from Bolshevism and prodded by Germany, had seceded from the Russian political community. Finland, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, together with the 'independent' Polish state created by the Germans in 1917, were demanding recognition as sovereign national states. This separatist movement also brought into being a short-lived Ukrainian state and united Bessarabia with Rumania. The Germans had intended to organize all these lands as protected dependencies of the Central empires, but the armistice of November 11 required the German armies to evacuate this entire region. What now was to be the status of these new-born political bodies? The Allies were committed by the Fourteen Points to establishing an 'independent Polish state', although no frontiers had been defined. But were these German creations in the Baltic and Ukraine to be recognized and supported? Or were the Bolsheviks to be permitted to overrun them? What of the reigning dogma of 1918, the right of national self-determination? Did it apply to the seceding tribes of western Russia or only to Russia as a whole, as that state had been before its subversion and under whatever political regime might emerge from the civil war? To none of these questions were the Western Powers able to give definite answer when the Peace Conference assembled in January, 1919. The victor nations had no agreed-upon Russian policy. One school of opinion opposed all dealings with the Bolsheviks and favored full support for the anti-Bolshevik separatist forces, especially the Poles, in order to create an east European belt of insulation against the Red peril. Another and no less anti-communist view favored assistance for the armies seeking the full reconstruction of the Russian territorial state. A third view, to which both Wilson and Lloyd George inclined, was that contact should be made and negotiations opened with Moscow. But with counsels divided nothing definite was done for several months. Men were not wanting who urged that the Russian question was primary and had to be settled before a secure arrangement of Europe could be achieved; but things were not done in that order.

The French Government and Allied Generalissimo Foch desired a collective military action to suppress the communist regime and bring back the 'real Russia' into the European state system. Winston Churchill, then British War Secretary, held substantially the same view and even favored German participation in the action, for he held the statesmanlike opinion that this common enterprise might make for reconciliation among western nations at the same time that it rescued a gallant ally from an unparalleled disaster. Wilson and Lloyd George, however, chose a policy of mediation to bring opposing Russian forces to some kind of liberal

compromise. Toward that end the Allies tried to arrange a truce and get the leaders of both sides to a conference. But the effort failed, and the Allied statesmen, late in the spring of 1919, entered into an agreement with the political leaders of the anti-Bolshevik cause in Russia.

#### *Mutual Promises*

The avowed purpose was to crush communism, summon a constituent assembly, and establish a liberal constitutional government in Russia. Admiral Kolchak, the White chieftain, promised a regime of civil and religious liberty, recognition of the independence of Poland and Finland, and autonomy for Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania and the newly created Caucasian and Transcasian republics. He promised further to accept the decision of the Paris Peace Conference on the status of Bessarabia, to pay imperial Russia's foreign debts, and bring a renovated Russian state into the League of Nations. The program was not, it should be remembered, of counter-revolutionary character, but wholly in accord with the Fourteen Points and the triumphant ideology of 1918. In return for these promises Kolchak was to receive Allied aid in food, arms, advisers and technicians. For political, military and financial reasons the Allied and Associated Powers were unable to supply troops or large sums of money, but as Winston Churchill wrote, "they could give a steady aid in surplus munitions, in moral countenance and in concerted diplomacy. Had they acted together simply and sincerely within these limitations, they might have reached a good result. But their decisions . . . represented only half a mind. The other half had always been, and was throughout the summer of 1919, uncertain of itself, sceptical about the prospects of the anti-Bolsheviks, ill-informed about the true nature of the Soviet Government and the Third International, and anxious to see whether the extremists in Moscow would not respond to the exercise of reason and patience."

#### *Why the Reds Won*

The policy of the Allied and Associated Powers,—if indeed we may say that half-hearted and divided counsels actually constituted a policy,—issued in miserable failure. The Bolsheviks won the civil war, and the reasons why they won are very clear. In the first place, Allied intervention in Russia, although too small to give victory to the Whites, was sufficient to enable the Reds to identify their cause with that of patriotic resistance against the foreigner. Secondly, the Allied Powers bound their White friends to what was, in Russia, an incomprehensible political purpose. The Russians might be rallied with a patriotic zeal for restoring the old sacred empire, or inspired with revolutionary ardor for the communist New Jerusalem, but there were few who knew or wanted the constitutional liberalism emanating from London, Paris and Washington. The blundering and ill-fated regime of Kerensky in 1917 had proved that. The White cause thus was tainted by a somewhat alien character, and to the extent that the leaders sought to remove the taint their movement degenerated into reactionary counter-revolution; this at once gave ad-

(Please turn to page eighty-nine)



# The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A CATHOLIC QUARTERLY  
for Teachers and Students of History

Acting Editor: JOHN F. BANNON

Consultant: JOSEPH S. BRUSHER

## Staff

ROBERT J. IMBS      JOHN G. HOLBROOK  
JAMES J. SCHLAFLY      ROBERT P. NEENAN  
RICHARD S. CROWLEY      CHARLES I. PRENDERGAST  
LEONARD P. PIOTROWSKI      PETER M. WILEY

## Advisory Board

MARTIN J. HARNEY      W. PATRICK DONNELLY  
Boston College      Jesuit High  
THOMAS F. MAHER      PETER M. DUNNE  
Gonzaga University      University of San Francisco  
CHARLES H. METZGER      GERALD G. WALSH  
West Baden College      Fordham University

JOHN J. CAMPBELL, Business Manager

Address communications to The Historical Bulletin, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

## EDITORIALS

May 24, 1943, will mark the four hundredth anniversary of the death of Copernicus. It will also mark the four hundredth anniversary of the publication of the great work "the *Almagest* of modern astronomy," as it has been called, *De Revolutionibus Orbium Caelestium Libri VI*. For, as Copernicus lay upon his deathbed, the emissary of the Nuremburg publisher Petreius, or perhaps the publisher himself, rushed to the bedside of the dying seventy-year old Copernicus, (he was born probably in 1473) who almost with his last gesture and the last glance of his eye, beheld the fruits of his lifetime of work and placed his benediction upon it. Copernicus died and modern astronomy was born in the same instant of time. He died at Frauenburg, an important town in East Prussia near Königsberg which at the time of Copernicus's life was held by Poland. Poland today regards Copernicus among her greatest sons and the monument to him at Warsaw attests to the national veneration.

### *The Theory in the Making*

The fame of Copernicus in the world's history rests, to be sure, upon his work as an astronomer. He wrote little but studied much; he spoke little but meditated ceaselessly; he worked prodigiously but all through his many activities in the background of his thought was always the vast theory that was shaping itself in his contemplative mind. He had read and re-read Ptolemy and the works of all those who had followed him in the interpretation of the movement of the heavenly bodies. He saw all too clearly the inaccuracies and the contradictions of the view that the heavens revolve around the earth. During years of his meditations he became more and more impressed by the violence done to human thinking in the face of ascertained facts of nature, in the acceptance of the view that a static earth should be the center of a movable universe. The transition in his thinking from a geocentric beginning to a heliocentric concept took more than twenty-five years in its shaping. No premature announcement of growing convictions could or did Copernicus make. No fanfare of "successful research" was sounded by him before the world of thought or the illiterate world of those whose admira-

tion and favor he might have gained by posing as the great man of learning. His nights were spent in the watchtower of his seclusion, where none could see the slowly brightening flare of recognition of the truth as his eyes glanced heavenward, a flare which began as the tiniest spark and became the torch of the new truth of science that illuminates a world that had waited for uncounted centuries for a recognition of what has become for us today an axiomatic truism. His days were spent as a physician in the medical care of his uncle, the Bishop, as far as his official appointment was concerned, but his time was also given to the care of the poor to whom he devoted himself by preference in the love of the charity of his soul. He used his great position as episcopal physician to make himself more effectively the physician of poverty.

### *The De Revolutionibus*

In the first of the six books of the *De Revolutionibus*, Copernicus clinches forthright with his problem. Why should the earth be the center of the universe? The philosophical arguments of Aristotle and of Ptolemy are examined for both their logical and their objective cogency and are found wanting. A heliocentric interpretation of the phenomena of physical nature can more validly explain the accumulated observations of the movement of the heavenly bodies. He deduces from his accumulated data, the three-fold movement of the earth, its diurnal revolution on its own axis, its translatory movement around the sun and, finally, the conic movement of the earth's axis which enables the axis to remain constantly paralleled to itself.

In his second book, he carries his thinking further to discuss the phenomena of day and night, of the "rising" and "setting" of the sun and of the heavenly bodies and of the many phenomena of the earth's motion with reference to the zodiac. In the third book, he attempts to apply his solution of his problems to the urgent questions associated with the reform of the calendar. The fourth book deals with the movements of the moon; the fifth with the movement of the planets; and the sixth with the measurement of the celestial latitudes and



longitudes and their relation to the corresponding terrestrial measurements.

Even at the early age of thirty-four years Copernicus had reached convictions concerning the fundamental concepts of his epoch-making thinking; yet in the silence of his laboratory he waited for twenty-five years before he undertook the systematic presentation of his views, and when he had finished his writing he waited for ten more years until, yielding to the pressure of friends and admirers, he unwillingly and modestly yielded his manuscript to the publishers. In his authoritative evaluation of Copernicus's life and labor, Adolph Müller, S.J., notes that "that manuscript fortunately, one might almost say miraculously, has been preserved to the present day. At the present time (1898) it is in the possession of Count Nostitz (Graf von Nostitz) in Prague, who preserves it as the most valuable family treasure. Bound in parchment, the manuscript has 217 leaves (not pages) 209 of which are the autographic production of the hand of the great astronomer himself most carefully and clearly written. The initials as well as the titles are outlined in red. The text shows numerous corrections particularly towards the end; sometimes entire half pages are crossed out and revised versions are written in the margin. The figures reveal an excellent draftsman."

The temptation to launch forth upon an analysis of the great mind of one of the world's greatest astronomers, in many respects, of the greatest astronomer in the history of mankind is hard to resist. But there is so much more to be said of Copernicus.

#### *Was He a Priest?*

Was he a priest? We know that for several years he studied Canon Law in Italy and probably in Rome itself. We know also that his uncle, the Bishop of Frauenburg, attempted seriously to appoint him to a vacant canonry at the Cathedral. Adolph Müller, S.J., admits that he received Minor Orders and was universally regarded as a cleric. More recent researches (1933), however, and the discovery of archives in Bologna would seem to indicate that Copernicus was ordained at the early age of twenty-four years. Whatever the facts may be, and the controversial point is surely not without its apologetic value, we know that Copernicus spent all the years of his life subsequent to his university studies in close relationship with the ecclesiastical coterie that surrounded his episcopal uncle, and it was at the Frauenburger Cathedral that he found the facilities and the leisure for the pursuit of his astronomical researches. Brachvogel in his magnificent address before the surgeons of northeastern Germany, who met at the Copernicus house in Frauenburg in 1936, points out that the argument against assuming ordination falls far short of both historical and logical cogency. It has been previously assumed that if Copernicus practiced medicine, he could not have been a priest. Brachvogel shows, first, that Copernicus never took his degree in medicine but rather in Canon Law and, secondly, that several physician contemporaries of Copernicus were members of the cathedral chapter of Frauenburg, the names of three of them being well known through contemporary documents. Brachvogel, furthermore, makes much of the fact that many scholars in the sixteenth century

passed easily from the vocation of physician to that of the priest and that many a priest supplemented his spiritual activity by giving care to the body. It would seem that according to Brachvogel's interpretation, a priest might practice medicine without at the same time being officially designated as a physician. In the life of Copernicus, his activity as a physician fills thirty or more years of an extremely busy public-spirited and devoted life. It would seem that the problem of Copernicus's ordination must await further historical research.

#### *Many-sided Genius*

Physician, priest, astronomer—and yet the many-sided activity of Copernicus can be adequately described only through many an additional chapter. Aloof though he seems to have been with reference to his astronomical studies, he was surely not aloof from the activity of the world in which he lived, not aloof from government or people, not aloof from rich or poor, from the learned and the illiterate. He was sent upon many a diplomatic mission by ecclesiastical and civil authorities always with the assurance of success and with credit to the person whom he represented. He was the administrator of the temporalities of the diocese of his uncle, appointed not through nepotism but through the election of the cathedral chapter. For several years, he acted as the civic administrator (mayor) of the city of his residence. He was called to the peace table to assist in the drafting of treaties of peace between many of the warring factions in that war-torn area which never, apparently, even down to our own day, has been free from the threat of violence, poverty and disease due to the restlessness of rulers and peoples. He acted as peace-maker in countless private, civil contests and reached his decisions with mildness and mercy when fixing blame. Apparently also, he had made himself an authority on the monetary systems of Poland, Prussia and Lithuania and this to such an extent that when a new fiscal system and coinage became necessary for Ermland, Copernicus himself was chosen to effect the governmental reforms. He inspired much of the controversial literature of northern Germany against Luther and must have been recognized as a capable and violent opponent of Luther. There is no evidence that he ever came into personal contact with Luther. It is known, however, that Copernicus had well informed himself not only of the life and the teaching of the Wittenberg reformer but also that he conducted personal investigations of the progress which the reformation was making and sent reports to many a civil and ecclesiastical authority concerning the progress of the new movement. It is true that towards the end of his life, he felt that his remaining years must be devoted more and more to the study and development of the magnificent astronomical theory to which he had given so much of his very full life, and during the last few years before his death we find him more and more immersed in the study of the heavens.

#### *More than an Astronomer*

To be sure, all this is vastly inadequate. If nothing further has been done, at least this much has been pointed out, that Copernicus though his fame rests upon

(Please turn to page ninety)



# Autonomy for Alsace-Lorraine

William H. Maehl, M. A.

St. Louis University

ALSACE-LORRAINE has often heard the long roll of drums in the past. Sprawled out angularly behind the Rhine crossings like some drowsy watch dog, the land, in all ages, has hearkened to the clank of marching armies. Ethnically the denizens are mainly Teutonic, but they are often fervently French in sentiment. For as long as men can remember, they have vacillated between two allegiances almost as the waters of Lorraine divide on her plateau to join the Moselle or the Rhine. The combined influences of topography, geography, race, and religion have given this people a singular history.

The currently disputed region occupies only 5,600 sq. miles, less than half the expanse of Belgium. Its population is today probably in the neighborhood of 2,500,000. Alsace-Lorraine is a beguiling country set like a sapphire between the great Rhine waterway and the weathered line of the Vosges mountains. To the northwest it escapes from the margin of the blue Alsatian hills and verges over a fertile plateau to the Luxembourg border. The contested territory includes most of historic Alsace and a large piece of old Lorraine. Of Alsace, only the southern fortress of Belfort, guarding the *Trouée de Belfort*, and Gallic *Sundgau* remained with France after 1871. They have not been absent from the French muster for centuries. *Ancienne Lorraine*, whose bygone capital was Nancy, was much larger than German-annexed *Lothringen*. This province, the bulk of which France retained after her war with Prussia, lies west and northwest of Alsace on the other side of the Vosges. It is watered by the Moselle and Saar river systems. In olden times Lorraine included not only the old appanage of the Dukes of Lorraine but the duchies of Bar and Vaudemont too. Of that part of Lorraine ceded to Germany by the Treaty of Frankfurt, only a fraction of the territory transferred (Metz, and the surrounding *pays Messin*) was inhabited by French stock. With insignificant exceptions, on the other hand, all of Alsace was the home of a Teutonic people.

## Importance of the Territory

The region is of vast economic importance. Lorraine itself is believed to have the greatest iron deposits on the continent. In the past they have been well-nigh indispensable to German industry which, without them, had not the advantage that ownership of large ore deposits in French Lorraine conferred on Gallic industry. Aside from iron there are important coal beds around Saargemünd. Silver, arsenic, cobalt, salt, copper and considerable quantities of war-essential potash are scattered in central Lorraine and along the valley of the Ill and its tributaries.

Irreducible blocs of French and German settlements are juxtaposed in Alsace-Lorraine. The line separating French from German speaking communities roughly parallels the crest of the Vosges mountains in the south. In the north it turns diagonally westward from Ludenreth, running thence a few leagues east of Metz to the

Luxembourg frontier. Thus Mulhouse, Colmar, Strasbourg, Haguenau, Sarrelbe, and Diendenhofen (Thionville in French) are German. Metz and the *pays Messin*, Nancy, Lunéville, Toul and Bruyères are French. For over a thousand years there have been no significant changes in the linguistic map of the country. These facts are important and must be kept in mind if the problem of Alsace-Lorraine autonomy is to be understood correctly.

## Medieval Backgrounds<sup>1</sup>

The kaleidoscopic changes in political boundaries contrast strangely with the static ethnic line. In medieval times the fragments of Alsace (or *Elsass*) were myriad. Besides a host of principalities belonging to the Holy Roman Emperor, to German princes beyond the Rhine or to imperial knights, there were a number of free cities<sup>2</sup> owing fealty only to the Emperor. Yet the people of this nebula were exposed to a common cultural education. Over a very long time they knew no law save German law and no authority save German authority. As in the time of Julius Caesar, when the land had been beyond the pale of Latin culture, medieval Alsatians, isolated from France by the Vosges, still possessed an ethos which came from the world east of the Rhine. Literature, music, architecture, customs, the whole manner of life of this people, from the rugged elegance of their cathedrals to the gruff lampoons of their tipplers, all exude *Deutsche Spracheinheit*.

On the death of Charlemagne, Alsace and Lorraine had been joined to Lothaire's<sup>3</sup> patrimony, the so-called Middle Kingdom. Thereafter the feudal history of Alsace was the tedious chronicle of interminable dynastic wars and the piece-meal barter of her hapless people. With the decline of feudalism and the dawn of the modern states era, Alsace was still found as a land over which, with waning force, the pale light of the Holy Roman Empire shone. But she was becoming more and more a no-man's land, a march or a buffer land between Hapsburg and Bourbon dominions. As such she played an obscure game on the European chess board until the time of Louis XIV.

Lorraine exhibited the same "*zersplitterung*" which characterized other feudal states. Her political consolidation was similarly impeded by the dispersion of her territory among duchies and bishoprics. Besides the duchies of Lorraine, Bar and Vaudemont there were the independent bishoprics of Metz, Toul, Nancy and Verdun. Most of the princes, lay or ecclesiastical, were also enfeoffed to the Holy Roman Emperor who, as time passed, became simply a *German Emperor*. But it is

<sup>1</sup> In order to appreciate fully the delicate nature as well as the subtle ramifications of the Alsace-Lorraine question, a grasp of the true significance of the history of the territory is essential. Without it no solution to the problem is morally possible. For this reason it has been thought necessary to outline the main historical points at some length and in detail.

<sup>2</sup> Landau, Colmar, Rosheim, Munster, Türkheim, Kayserburg, etc.

<sup>3</sup> From this circumstance is derived the name "*Lothringen*."



significant that the Dukes of Lorraine and Bar, unlike their ultramontane cousins, soon evinced a preference for the French orbit.

#### *France Faces East*

Had Austria or Prussia, rather than France, first succeeded in sweeping out the débris of feudalism from the German household, Alsace would probably never have been drawn into the Gallic establishment. It was the fact that France first achieved national unity and administrative centralization that decided the fate of old Lorraine and altered that of Alsace. By abandoning feudalism and by fashioning a practicable theory of indivisible sovereignty before her German rivals, France gained an inestimable advantage in the race for territorial aggrandizement. No such strong centripetal force was operating in the Germanies. Austria and Prussia, emerging at last with definite lineaments from the dust of the Empire, immediately fell to blows over the political and religious primacy of the Germanies. In the dreary wars of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Austria frequently found herself embroiled with France as well as Prussia. Austria, a polyglot empire in which centrifugal tendencies of her dissimilar people furnished an internal situation that always bordered on the desperate, had not the strength to check both French and Prussian aggrandizement at her expense. Eventually Austria could no longer check the French advance towards the Rhine.

#### *The Advance Begins*

In 1552 Henry II made the first important advance in this direction. By the Treaty of Chambord he secured the bishoprics of Verdun, Metz and Toul. All efforts of the German Emperor to recover this ground failed. From then until now these regions remained in French possession.

By the Treaty of Westphalia (1648) France acquired from the Emperor an imperfect title to Imperial hereditaments in Alsace. The ghost of sovereignty over Alsace did not satisfy the ambitious Louis Quatorze. This dazzling and unscrupulous personality coveted the Rhine River as the "natural" eastern frontier of his realm. He set about by chicanery to realize his dream. From the compliant jurists of his notorious "Chambers of Reunion" Louis elicited the untenable opinion that all Alsace rightfully belonged to France. With a fabricated lien in his wallet to accommodate a not too fastidious international morality, Louis rudely thrust the Alsations under the lilies of France. Strasbourg refused to genuflect and Louis stormed the city in 1681. Then he sent his ace military engineer, Vauban, to convert the city into a French bastion on the Rhine. Alone of Alsace, Mulhouse escaped Louis' avid grasp. This enclave remained a part of the Swiss Cantonal system until 1798 when, prompted by the successes of French arms in Switzerland, she voluntarily sought union with France of the Directory.

As for Lorraine, by mid-eighteenth century her territory had fallen into the hands of Louis XV's father-in-law, the perennial but unsuccessful candidate for the Polish throne, Stanislaus Leszcynski. In the spiral of eighteenth century diplomacy, upon the death of Stanislaus, Lorraine passed under the banner of France. This was in 1766. Although a Teutonic minority seemed

to resent the transfer, most Lorrains welcomed annexation to the mother land.

In the pre-revolutionary age Alsace-Lorraine was exposed to Bourbon absolutism and centralization. Intendants and hordes of petty officials going to the valley of the Ill on the king's business carried a bit of France in their valises. They introduced a French patois among the populace. The Government, however, sought not to uproot Allemanic culture there but, more artfully, preferred to see it drown in a rising sea of French civilization.

#### *The Revolution Comes to Alsace*

In Voltaire's day the land shared in the influences of the "Enlightenment" as it did also in the German "*Aufklärung*." Then in 1789, when France went up in smoke, her back porch caught fire too.

Although the Alsacien-Lorrains were not always in sympathy with the government in Paris, the Revolution, like a reducing furnace, effaced the less obdurate marks of Alsatian particularism. The levelling reforms of 1789 came here too. Personal feudatory rights and dues, abolished by the National Assembly in the course of the hectic night of August 4th, disappeared in Alsace likewise. The Rhine provinces were divided administratively into the departments of Moselle, Haute- and Bas-Rhin.

Unsettled by the first tidal wave of enthusiasm for the revolt against privilege, the populace soon showed it refused to be reduced to stultifying conformity. The passage of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, and the attack on the Church and the immemorial Faith alienated the Alsatian peasantry. They found allies in their opposition to the Government in the ruined nobility and the expropriated prelates. The malcontents were later joined by the respectable bourgeois element which was antagonised by the anti-federalism and the social policy of the Robespierrists. Despite the huge Phrygian cap, symbol alike of liberty and terror, which adorned the spire of Strasbourg Cathedral, unity of support for the Revolution was lacking in this land. Alsace-Lorraine had its revolutionary tribunals, its Jacobin clubs, and its guillotines. Yet even after the provocative temptation of German armies had been removed by the victories of Landau and Kaiserlautern (Fall of 1793), the departments of Haute-Rhin and Bas-Rhin remained incubators of royalism and counter-revolution. A miniature Vendée existed here. Crippled from internal and external strife, this people survived the storm of the year II, their banner of particularism at half mast but still unfurled.

The memories which attached Alsacien-Lorrains to France during the Revolution and Empire were at least as strong as the Jacobinism which repelled them. It was in Strasbourg that the Marseillaise had been composed by Rouget de Lisle. It had been General François de Kellermann, of Alsatian German lineage, who in 1792 at Valmy, the French Thermopylae, had turned back Brunswick's Prussians and had thereby saved France and the Revolution.

Twenty-eight Alsacien generals have had their names inscribed upon the *Arc de Triomphe*. Among them were Napoleon's coadjutant Lefèbvre; Marshal Ney, who had

(Please turn to page eighty-six)



# Why the League Failed

Samuel A. Johnson, Ph. D.

*Harris State Teachers College  
St. Louis, Mo.*

IN any attempt to draw upon history for the light it can throw upon problems of today, account must be taken of the world's experience with the League of Nations. It would undoubtedly be enlightening to trace in some detail the history of the League and its attempts—some successful and some not—to deal with international problems. However, in view of the necessary space limitations, it would appear to be more profitable to confine our attention to those features of the background and character of the League that seem to have some direct bearing on the problem of organizing the peace.

## *The Background of the League*

We are apt to think of the League of Nations as the brainchild of Woodrow Wilson, fathered by the League to Enforce Peace in which such eminent Americans as ex-President Taft and President A. Lawrence Lowell of Harvard took an active part. Some writers have traced the genesis of the idea back to the ancient Greeks and on up through the contributions of notable medieval and modern thinkers to the eve of World War I.<sup>1</sup> Certainly President Wilson's part in the drafting and adoption of the Covenant is not to be minimized, nor is the spadework done by the League to Enforce Peace. But we will get a better perspective on the League and its place in history—and possibly on its bearings on our problem of post-war planning—if we look at it as a stage in modern international development as a part of a great historic trend.

Seen from this angle, the direct ancestor of the League was the Concert of Powers, set up at the close of the Napoleonic Wars. Since the days of Cardinal Wolsey in the early sixteenth century, the states of Europe had based their relations with each other on the doctrine of balance of power. No state was to be permitted to become strong enough to imperil the security of its neighbors, but the only machinery devised to maintain this balance was a scheme of shifting alliances. When an aggressor such as Louis XIV or Frederick the Great set out to upset the balance in favor of his own state he would, of course, attach to himself as many and as powerful allies as possible, while the states whose interests were affected adversely would band together to maintain or redress the balance. As a consequence Europe was kept in a state of almost constant warfare for two centuries. This was international anarchy. Even the concept of international law which began to take shape during these centuries attempted little more than to set up certain rules of the game—rules that could be enforced only by an appeal to arms.

So long as wars were fought only by professional soldiers and did not seriously disturb the economy of the beligerent states, this arrangement was considered satisfactory. But then came the French Revolutionists and Na-

poleon introducing a new type of warfare: national warfare waged by citizen soldiers and involving the whole population. Moreover, Napoleon upset the balance of power to a degree that had not been seen since the idea was born. Clearly, this called for a new basis of world politics and a new concept in international relations. The statesmen of the major powers in 1814 and 1815 were not yet ready to abandon the balance of power idea. Indeed, at the Congress of Vienna they redrew the map in a manner intended to create a new balance. But they did see the need to create machinery to maintain the balance, and the result was the Concert of Powers.

Austria, Britain, Prussia, and Russia had banded themselves together in a coalition or alliance to overthrow Napoleon and to restore the independence of the subjugated states—that is, to restore the balance of power. When victory was in sight, the statesmen of these powers decided to project the alliance into the post-war peace and agreed, in the Treaty of Chaumont, that when the peace of Europe should be threatened they would "concert together" on what measures should be taken. At first the Quadruple Alliance and the Concert of Powers were virtually identical, but the admission of France in 1818 made it include all of the then major powers. The machinery of the Concert was the international congress of powers meeting on call as situations might arise. For a few years it worked according to plan, but the withdrawal of Great Britain in 1822 appeared to reduce the Concert to a fiction. However, the idea of the Concert lived on. The Congress of Paris in 1856 and the Congress of Berlin in 1878 kept the principle alive, and between the last date and the First World War the Concert resumed full activity. In 1906 the United States participated for the first time as a recognized member of the Concert in the Algeiras Congress.

The Concert succeeded in resolving the several crises of the early 1900's, but failed to avert the World War. This stimulated a widespread feeling, evidenced by our own League to Enforce Peace along with other organizations, that a more effective agency of international co-operation was needed. Thus the League represented an effort to salvage what was valid of the Concert of Powers and to provide more adequate machinery through which international cooperation could function. A loose association of nations was replaced with a confederation of nations.

## *A Step Forward*

The League was a real step forward from the loosely knit Concert. It rested on a legal foundation, the Covenant, whereas the Concert had rested on little more than tacit acceptance. It provided adequate machinery for international cooperation. Where the Concert had had recourse only to occasional congresses called to deal with specific problems, the League, with its frequent meetings of the Council and its annual meetings of the Assembly, provided a forum in which problems could be

<sup>1</sup> A good but brief summary of this ideational background is given in Walter Consuelo Langsam, *The World Since 1914*, 3d edition, pp. 139-142.



met as they might arise, or even be anticipated. Its administrative adjuncts, such as the World Court and the International Labor Office, performed vital services in their respective spheres. The League succeeded in solving a number of international disputes, some rather serious in character. Its greatest triumphs were the settlement of the Aland Island dispute between Finland and Sweden, and the Mosul dispute between Turkey and Iraq. But as we know all too well, the League failed when confronted with the upsurge of totalitarian aggression. Whether or not the League's record would have been noticeably better had we of the United States taken our place as a member, is now merely an academic question that can never be answered. Perhaps it would have been, but with world conditions what they were in the 1930's it is extremely doubtful if the participation of the United States would have enabled the League to avert the present war.

This does not mean, however, that the League was a total loss. Its accomplishments more than justified its existence. The World Court and the International Labor Office certainly deserve to be salvaged. The work of the League in administering internationalized territories, in supervising mandates, in protecting racial and religious minorities, and in various other areas, was a net gain. Its efforts to codify international law and to make the rules something more than vaguely accepted usages deserve to be followed up. Instead of thinking of the League as an isolated experiment that failed, it is more realistic to think of it as a step in development which, since it proved inadequate for a great emergency, calls for a further step. The Concert of Powers was a step forward from an old international anarchy. It accomplished much, but broke down in the face of a major crisis in world affairs and so gave birth to the League as a further step in the direction of international order. Similarly the breakdown of the League in the face of a still greater crisis gives promise of leading to a still further step in the same direction.

Since the pronouncements of most responsible statesmen and the clear drift of public sentiment in the United Nations indicate clearly that the trend is toward the creation of some new type of international organization to carry on after this war from the point at which the League left off, it is fitting that we seek to discover the reasons for the League's inadequacy and strive to correct the shortcomings. Was the fault in the structure of the League? Was it in the character of the member states? Or was the whole idea an impossible aspiration inconsistent with human nature?

#### *The League as a Confederation*

Tackling these questions in reverse order, there is no good reason to assume that international organization is out of keeping with human nature or human possibilities. The whole trend of social development has been the enlargement of the security group from the family through the clan, the tribe, the city state, and the feudal state to the national state. Indeed in the Middle Ages the Church itself provided, for western Christendom at least, an international organization that achieved many of the goals to which we now aspire in an organization of nations. There is no reason to assume that the absolutely sovereign national state represents the last word

in human political development, or that sovereign nations are incapable of cooperating to maintain an orderly world.

The character of the member states probably contributed to the final failure of the League. Certainly it was the ruthless aggressiveness of certain members that led them to defy the League, to withdraw from membership when restraints were attempted, and to plunge the world into war. But this is the very situation that the League was created to overcome. Its inability to do so indicates some fundamental weakness in the structure of the League itself.

In looking for this fundamental weakness it is not necessary to examine or even to list all the numerous criticisms that have been directed at the League. It is inherent in the basic concept: the League of Nations was a confederation. A confederation may be defined as an organization of states which goes beyond a mere alliance or association in that it is intended to be permanent and that definite machinery is set up for cooperation, but in which the states still retain their complete sovereignty and freedom of action. This usually implies several things. For one thing, it usually means that unanimous consent is required for binding action. In the case of the League, unanimous consent of the Council was necessary except that the votes of nations concerned in a dispute were not counted. This requirement of unanimity frequently makes it possible for one disgruntled state to block highly important action. It means, too, that a state cannot be coerced. Pressure, such as economic sanctions, may be applied to a member state, but there is no machinery for actual compulsion. In a confederation there is no means of enforcing the decisions of the group upon the member states; each state is left to do its own enforcing. Finally, any state is at liberty to withdraw from a confederation; in the League of Nations the only requirement was the giving of two years notice, and this was only a technicality. What this all adds up to is that the successful operation of a confederation depends upon the voluntary cooperation of the member states. In this respect, the League of Nations merely repeated the experience of all confederations. When things are going smoothly, the members of a confederation cooperate, but in times of stress members who feel that their interests are affected adversely either withdraw or block action by their refusal to be bound by the decisions of the other members.

#### *Some Interesting Parallels*

It is interesting if not enlightening to compare the experience of the League of Nations with that of other confederations of history. From the ancient Delian League to the League of Nations, no confederation has been permanently successful. Some have lasted for considerable periods of time, either because no great crisis arose to work their disruption or because they were forced into cooperation by external pressure. But sooner or later, every one has either broken up or developed into a closer union. Many of those in modern times have developed into federal unions. Our own history furnishes a case in point. During the War for Independence the hitherto separate colonies (states after 1776) joined in a loose association analogous to the Concert of Europe. The Continental Congress, like the congresses of the



Concert, had no legal foundation and could only concert plans for cooperative action. When this loose association proved inadequate to the prosecution of the war, the states, after much difficulty and delay, formed a confederation with the Articles of Confederation as the "covenant" of their league. Although the details of organization differed somewhat from those of the later League of Nations, the fundamental character of the two organizations was much the same. Both depended upon the voluntary, cooperation of the member states. Just as the League failed to cope with the world crisis of the 1930's, so our Confederation proved unable to cope with the continental crisis that followed the War for Independence. Like the League it accomplished much and was a step forward, but it proved inadequate to meet the conditions it was called upon to face. In our case the problem was solved by the creation of a federal union under the Constitution of the United States.

Much the same thing happened in the other confederations. The Swiss, the Dutch, the Germans, and the Argentinians had similar experiences, differing only in details. The Dutch provinces began with a loose association, then formed a confederation, and finally created a federal union. The Germanies, in the later centuries of the Holy Roman Empire, were only a very loose association of sovereign states. After the Napoleonic Wars they formed a confederation, and in the days of Bismarck combined into a federal union. The Swiss, thanks largely to external pressure, maintained their confederation longer than most other peoples, but even they finally had to transform their confederation into a true federal union. The fact that, for more than a century, these cantons, speaking three languages and divided in religion, have been successful as a federal union is at least a hint that diverse nations might be able to subordinate their differences in a world organization.

All historians agree that historical parallels are not to be taken too seriously. These parallels may appear to prove too much. They would appear to indicate that the next step for the confederation of the League of Nations would be a federal union of the United Nations. This might be perfectly logical historically, but it is not necessarily feasible. Rather than jump to such a conclusion, we will do well, while recognizing the League as a step toward a more effective international organization, to try to discover the lessons it may offer for the preparation of the next immediate step.

#### *The Lessons of the League*

First of all it would appear obvious that much of the League is worth reviving and preserving. Certainly the work of its administrative agencies in such fields as labor, codification of international law, preventive medicine, and the suppression of traffic in slaves, women and children, and opium, should be continued by any new international organization that may be set up. Any new organization that may be formed will likewise have to perform the League's functions of administering internationalized territory and supervising mandates, though the mandate system itself probably needs modification. Some such machinery as the League provided for an international forum for the discussion and adjustment of problems is an obvious necessity in any plan for or-

ganizing peace. Possibly the exact form of organization could be improved, but this is a detail. Indeed, there is much to be said for the case of those who hold that the League as such should be revived and strengthened. Probably the name League of Nations is so discredited that a new name—perhaps United Nations—should be substituted, but that need not involve much change in the basic plan.

Still any plan of strengthening the League, or whatever its successor may be called, must take account of the specific points at which the old League failed. Its most obvious failure, of course, was its inability to enforce its decisions against aggressors. The League itself had no armed forces, and the provision of the Covenant for calling upon member states to take forcible action could not be invoked because the members were unwilling to go to war when they could not see that their immediate interests were directly threatened. Several proposals were made to arm the League, but world opinion was not yet ready for such a drastic step. Today, however, signs of the times indicate that public opinion is ready to indorse an international police force to be administered by an international organization. Such a step would transform such an organization into a quasi-federal union and thus remedy the basic defect of the League, namely that it was a confederation. It would not, however, go the whole way as proposed by enthusiasts like Clarence Streit.<sup>2</sup>

#### *Further Difficulties*

Another failure lay in the ability of a member state to leave the League whenever action might be taken against it. Yet it is extremely doubtful if the present state of world opinion would tolerate the creation of a union from which members could not withdraw. This difficulty will have to be remedied indirectly by giving each member such a stake in the union that withdrawal will be clearly a disadvantage, and by striving to build up world opinion to support the union. Indeed this lack of popular support was the really fatal weakness of the old League. It failed to capture the imagination or loyalty of the people in the member states to a degree that would lead them to subordinate their nationalism to world interests. This fact lay back of the inability of the League to agree upon decisive action in the face of major crises. Just how a new organization is to remedy this difficulty is not clear. Advocates of real federal union argue that, since the union would operate directly on individuals and not on states, such a loyalty to the union would develop in time just as it did in the case of other confederations that turned into federal unions.

Finally, the League failed to avert this global war because it failed to solve the world problems that lay back of the war. It was the world depression with its economic dislocations—including the collapse of trade—as well as the spiritual bankruptcy of the 1920's that made the rise of totalitarianism possible. Even a federal union cannot prevent war among its members if the causes of friction among them are not removed; witness our own Civil War of the 1860's. If a new world organization built on the foundation of the League of

<sup>2</sup> Clarence Streit, *Union Now* (Shorter Version). New York, 1940.



Nations is to bring lasting peace to the world it must be empowered to remove or at least minimize the major causes of modern wars: trade barriers, imperialistic exploitation of weaker peoples, monopolistic cartels, and the crass materialism that grows out of an exaggerated economic nationalism. Unless the peoples of the world, including the people of the United States, have learned that the price of peace is a spirit of cooperation and a willingness to sacrifice some selfish national advantages for the common good of mankind, the lessons of the League will be lost on our generation.

## Alsace-Lorraine

(Continued from page eighty-two)

fought for the Emperor at Waterloo; Rapp, who excelled at Austerlitz and Custine of Metz. Lorraine gave two marshals to Bonaparte: Exelmans and Oudinot. In the nineteenth century fifty French generals, a nationalist historian in the person of Louis Madelin of Bar-le-duc, a score of members of the *Académie française* and a premier and president, Raymond Poincaré, were to come from Lorraine.

### Germany Regains Control

By the second Treaty of Paris (November 20, 1815) the fortress town of Landau and part of Frankonian Lorraine, embracing the rich coal deposits of the Saar and the city of Saarbrücken, were ceded to Prussia. Thereafter these regions never left German hands until after the first World War when the Saar, with its mines, was occupied by the French pending the results of a plebiscite to be held in 1935. By a landslide vote in that year Saarlanders effected the return of the region to Germany.<sup>4</sup>

Between 1815 and 1871 by far the greater part of Alsace-Lorraine remained with France. During fifty years the bonds of daily political and social intercourse drew the provinces slowly closer to France, while conversely for the German Fatherland grew weaker.<sup>5</sup>

By mid-century, however, Bismarck and the German nationalists had come to appreciate that in 1815 it had been a mistake to leave Alsace-Lorraine in the hands of France. Other considerations aside, Alsace was essential to the program of German unification. Without Strasbourg, the center of Rhenish Catholic and German culture, the South German states (Baden in particular) could not hope to participate wholeheartedly in the common political life of the projected *Deutsches Reich*.

On May 10, 1871, after an unsuccessful war, the blame for which Clemenceau once admitted rested with France, the Third Republic was forced to cede almost all of Alsace (save only the region around and including Belfort) and a considerable portion of Lorraine, including *le pays Messin* which was inhabited by French stock. The Franco-German border was pushed westward across the Rhine to the crest of the Vosges. The elder Moltke

<sup>4</sup> 98% of the registered voters went to the polls and, under the strictest surveillance of a League army, approximately 90% of this figure balloted in favor of returning the Saar to Germany. Only 2,124 advocated annexation to France.

<sup>5</sup> This is important to bear in mind.

<sup>6</sup> One factor the men at Paris overlooked was that mountains are better natural boundaries than rivers. This is an item that must be considered in the disposition of conquered territories.

had assured Bismarck that the Vosges Mountains were a more defensible boundary than the river Rhine. Even low mountains, he believed, offered better natural frontiers between nations than rivers. The general further pointed out that French possession of the west bank of the Rhine had for generations afforded France enormous strategic advantages and had entailed for Germany a costly *Wacht am Rhein*.<sup>6</sup>

German annexation of Metz seemed now to place France in an unfavorable military position. Metz dominated the approaches to the Moselle and Marne river systems; German possession of this strong point was expected to provide the *Reichwehr* with a coign of vantage from which an invasion might be launched against northern France. This fear proved unfounded. In two world wars the greater bastion of Verdun, standing behind Metz, has served to discourage strong offensives from the direction of Lorraine. Verdun, the Vosges Mountains and, more recently, the Maginot line dissuaded the Germans in 1914 and again in 1940 from hurling their *Blitz* attacks from this quarter. In fact the Germans never developed an effective offensive either across the Vosges or over the Lorraine plateau.<sup>7</sup>

After three years of German military dictatorship, the annexed provinces were, in 1874, provided with a provincial parliament, the *Landesausschuss*. The region was permitted a representation of fifteen deputies in the *Reichstag*, but it was to have no voice in the more important *Bundesrath*. Under this circumstance *Elsass-Lothringen* did not have an effective voice in the councils of the Empire, nor even in matters directly concerning itself.

### Under German Rule

The annexed territories were not in fact admitted to the German Empire on equal bases with the other member states. The acquisitions from France, won in the course of a common war in which all German states had made sacrifices, were legally regarded as the common property of the victor states in *Bundesrath* assembled. *Elsass-Lothringen* was thus *de jure*, as well as nominally, "*Reichsland*," that is, imperial territory. Its affairs were administered by the Kaiser who was the sovereign representative of the federated German Empire and who on behalf of the federated states exercised a trust over the "*Reichsland*." Inasmuch as the Kaiser was also King of Prussia, it was logical that this state, which dominated the *Bundesrath* with its seventeen votes, would from the outset dictate imperial policy towards the "*Reichsland*." The full implication of Prussian control over *Elsass-Lothringen* was not at first appreciated by the other German states. Only later did it become evident that by perpetuating the political insufficiency of the Imperial Territory, the interests of Prussia were being served at the expense of those of the south German states. By excluding Catholic *Elsass-Lothringen* from representation in the *Bundesrath*, the whole liberal and Catholic bloc of *Deutschen Mittelstaaten* was deprived

<sup>7</sup> The St. Mihiel salient of World War I, which represented an attempt to outflank the strong Vosges positions, never amounted to anything serious because Verdun could not be taken by direct assault. When this fortress fell in 1940, it was only successfully reduced by a much wider outflanking operation, a variation of von Schlieffen's swinging door plan by which the Verdun, Vosges and Belfort positions (the main Maginot line) were enveloped and ground between rear and frontal millstones.



of a potential ally against the encroachments of Protestant and militarist Prussia.

Between the laws of May 2, 1877 and May 31, 1911 there intervened for the "*Reichsland*" a period of "constitutional centralization" during which the provinces were administratively incorporated with the Reich. The ordinary affairs of the country were energetically supervised by a hierarchy of *Landesausschuss*, *Bundesrath*, *Reichskanzler*, and Kaiser. For a generation the "*Reichsland*" was the passive subject of legislation, a process in which she did not actively participate. During this period the region was not a state since it was devoid of the lineaments of sovereignty. The weak *Landesausschuss* did not so much represent the citizens of the "*Reichsland*" as it did the Imperial *Bundesrath*.

The creation of the office of *Statthalter* by the *Reichsgesetz* of July 4, 1879 did not materially alter the legal status of the Imperial Territory. Ultimate sovereignty continued to reside, not in the populace, but with Kaiser and Reich (*Bundesrath* and *Reichstag*).

#### *Opposition to Germany*

The majority of Alsacien-Lorrains of the generation of the Franco-Prussian war, they who had learned to hate by shell and fire, were never reconciled to their new masters.<sup>8</sup> They baffled every effort of the Government to effect their assimilation with Germany.

Under the lax rule of Napoleon III the Alsatians had been permitted to speak and teach their German dialect. But *Deutsche Oberhoheit* saw the relegation of French to the status of a "*fremde Sprache*" in the schools. This being the antagonistic policy of Berlin, it was a foregone conclusion that the conciliatory gestures of the mild-mannered Field Marshal von Manteuffel (*Statthalter* from 1879-1885) would not succeed where the older generation was concerned. The Alsatians habitually answered good offices by returning an entire delegation of fifteen "*protestataires*" to the *Reichstag*. Manteuffel's successors fared no better. The utter breakdown of the Imperial Government's policy of assimilation was admitted by the future *Reichskanzler* von Caprivi: "It is a fact," said he, "that after seventeen years of annexation, the German spirit has made no progress in *Elsass-Lothringen*."

#### *Animosity Wanes*

However, seventeen years are but a moment in the history of a people. It could hardly be expected that even with a *deutschtümlich* people great changes could be wrought in such brief time and with such an unforgiving generation. The turn of the century and the appearance of new men who had never heard the bark of cannon brought an ebb in Alsatian animosity. Previous insistence upon freedom from Germany or retrocession to France waned before the shifting emphasis of Alsatian *Reichstag* deputies upon home rule within the framework of the Empire. It was not that conflict between Alsatians and their masters had disappeared. Goodness knows, the Government made enough blunders to keep resentment alive. But now spokesmen bent their labors to securing autonomy and equality for *Elsass-Lothringen* with other German states. A *Deutsche Spracheigenheit* which had never been destroyed was again slowly rising to the surface. Also the divisive

forces of Marxian socialism had invaded the "*Reichsland*." The ancient vertical cleavage in Alsatian sympathies along national lines was being obscured by an horizontal cleavage along class lines. Some Alsatian deputies, whose fathers had voted as "*protestataires*," now voted with the large socialist bloc in the *Reichstag*. These men thought much of international class solidarity and little of the independence question. Other deputies voted with the Nationalists and yet others with the Catholic center. Thus the "*Reichsland*" delegation no longer voted as a unit. It had shattered on the reefs of what Werner Sombart has called the "Economic Age."

#### *Home Rule for the "Reichsland"*

The Constitution granted *Elsass-Lothringen* in 1911 met a number of the citizens' demands.<sup>9</sup> A bicameral *Landtag*, competent to legislate on all matters save those affecting the fundamental law of the territory, was instituted. It replaced the *Landesausschuss*, which had only enjoyed a tinsel power, and flattered the people into thinking they had won their fight for home rule. Elections to the lower house were to proceed on the basis of universal manhood suffrage by secret ballot. Regrettably, the popular will could not even now be sure of execution, since the Kaiser, and through him the Prussian Government, preserved his right to veto undesirable legislation by the simple device of controlling the appointments of a majority in the complicated and aristocratic upper house. The *Statthalter*, moreover, remained the Emperor's minister in *Elsass-Lothringen*.

Although even after 1911 legislative home rule was not infrequently more theoretic than factual, the Constitution did accord the people of *Elsass-Lothringen* greater local autonomy than they had enjoyed under nineteenth century France or, indeed, than they were to experience under the Third Republic. Yet on the eve of the World War, as the Zabern incident<sup>10</sup> graphically demonstrated, *Elsass-Lothringen* had by no means abandoned its particularism.

#### *France Reclaims her "lost provinces"*

With the return of Alsace-Lorraine to France in 1919, it might be supposed that autonomist and separatist agitation would vanish, the advertised ambition of Alsatians for reunion with France having finally been achieved. Yet this was not the case. Alsatians speedily discovered that a highly centralized state such as the French was intolerant of local idiosyncracies. Under Germany after 1911 Alsatians had enjoyed considerable freedom in the management of finances, education, religion and local administration. Strasbourg had been the capital of a state of the German Empire. Now by French decree Alsatians were deprived of their hard won local legislature; their state was again partitioned into three departments (Moselle, Haute- and Bas-Rhin); and their proud capital was demoted to a mere prefecture. Such measures courted disaster. Sensitive par-

<sup>9</sup> An attempt to solve the problem of autonomy.

<sup>10</sup> The Zabern (Saverne) incident greatly embittered many Alsatians, as well as French, toward the German Government. It involved the inexcusably brutal treatment of a lame Alsatian shoemaker by one Lieutenant Baron von Forstner, stationed with the army garrison in Zabern. After preliminary court martial, Forstner was acquitted by a higher tribunal. The affair speedily assumed the proportions of a national issue. The *Reichstag* went so far as to censure the Bethmann-Hollweg Government for its support of the military who had vindicated Forstner in this matter.

<sup>8</sup> This is a point to be remembered.



ticularists smarted under the repressive policies. To add to the humiliation, administrators, dispatched to sweep out the German rubbish, proceeded in disregard of local prejudices and quite frequently could not even pay the compliment of speaking German.

The Radical Socialist ministry of Edouard Herriot proceeded systematically to root out provincial particularism, abolish the special privileges of the region, and accelerate the integration of land and people with the uniform French régime. The authorities discriminated against German in the Rhine-Moselle departments. French was declared the official tongue. During the crucial formative years a child was exposed to no formal German instruction and only later was it permitted, on request, to take German three hours per week.

#### *Religious Friction*

The efforts of Herriot's *Cartel des gauches* to enforce levelling conformity encountered opposition on religious grounds too. Under Germany, Alsace-Lorraine had been accorded complete religious freedom. The terms of the Napoleonic Concordat of 1801 had been scrupulously respected by the Reich which continued to permit local governing authorities to pay the salaries of the clergy. There was no interference with the control of the Church over education.

Upon their return to France the provinces discovered that the French Government had abrogated the Concordat of 1801. Since 1901 the Government had pursued a policy of sharpest separation of Church from State. Raymond Poincaré had promised to respect the religious privileges of Alsations. The Herriot Government scrapped these promises and did what it could to shear their Catholic Church of its ancient control over education. It sought to introduce a system of secular schools such as existed elsewhere in France. But to the Government's program of disestablishment and secularism, the intensely Catholic population was determined never to comply.

#### *An Impervious People*

Five years after the Peace conference of 1919 an Alsatian separatist movement was founded. Its avowed object was autonomy for German Alsace-Lorraine but only within the collective organization of a United States of Europe. This was really an independence movement. By 1928 separatism and home rule, ably disciplined by Dr. Ricklin and Baron Claus Zorn von Bulach, had become serious. Now it was the turn of France to ponder what it was to have her "Ireland." The autonomists shortly succeeded in electing three home rulers to the *Chambre*. There were some who now fought for recognition of provincial privileges who twenty years before had agitated for home rule under the Kaiser. They were not so much autonomists as they were Alsatian nationalists.

The *führer* of the autonomists under Germany had been the Abbé Wetterlé. The chief of the separatists in the twenties and thirties was Dr. Ricklin, an old foe of the Abbé. Dr. Ricklin assisted in the establishment of the Alsatian *Heimatbund* (Home Rule League) and a number of autonomist journals. In the twenties, the separatist press kept up a steady fire on the Government through the pages of such journals as *Die Zukunft*, *Die Volkstimme*, and *Die Wahrheit*.

The agitation of the German wards eventually reached such proportions that the French Government took alarm. The autonomist press was ordered to discontinue publication, while aged Raymond Poincaré (himself a Lorrain) was sent into the unruly departments to whip up enthusiasm for the Tricolor. In 1929 the whole question of Alsace-Lorraine was investigated by the *Chambre* which spent two weeks discussing the problem.

In the early thirties the Government headed by the Bloc National did succeed in mitigating the acute unrest in Alsace by making some concessions in the matter of education. But the Government refused to recede from its insistence upon national symmetry in essentials. Consequently the autonomist and separatist movements did not die. Such movements, in fact, were a normal expression of Alsatian politics. In place of the suppressed journals, new ones appeared in Strasbourg, Colmar, Mulhouse. *Die Neue Zukunft* proclaimed its sacred object, "the defense of imperilled home sovereignty." The weekly *Hausfreund für Stadt und Land*, edited at Spire, similarly cultivated separatism. Almost paradoxically such journals received support from the Communist inspired press, the *Neue Welt* and *L'Elz*. Likewise the autonomist deputy to the French *Chambre* from intractable old Saverne (Zabern), M. Camille Dahlet, was frequently seconded by the communist deputy, Jean Pierre Mourer, from Strasbourg. Dahlet's eulogies of *Deutschtum* found weird echo in the corroborant insistence of Mourer on the rights of minorities.

#### *Nazi Activity*

The rise of Nazism with its morbid concern for the principle of nationality, more particularly of German *Volkstum*, provoked a resurgence in "liberationist" sentiment toward the "lost provinces" beyond the Rhine. Under the Nazis learned societies for the study of Alsatian history proliferated. Among them was the *Zentralstelle für Heimatdienst* which was subsidized by the *Deutscher Schutzbund* in Berlin. This study center devoted two sections to Alsace and Lorraine. They operated under the presidency of Dr. Ernst, himself an Alsatian. The sections regularly published the *Elsass-Lothringische Heimatstimmen* and *Schutzbundbriefe*. The outstanding society, however, for the study of Alsatian history and ethnography was that directed by Dr. Daniel Krencher of Charlottenbourg, the so-called *Institut der Els-Lothring im Reich*. This bureau was affiliated with the University of Frankfurt and annually undertook the publication of an *Alsatian Yearbook*. In the 'twenties it had achieved publication of a monumental work on German administration in Alsace. Other societies in Germany, such as the *Verein für das Deutschland in Ausland* and the *Ausland Institut von Stuttgart*, although more general in purpose, directed an important part of their pan-German propaganda at the Alsatian separatists. Such propaganda, elaborate though it may have been, was indifferent to the profound needs of the Alsacien-Lorrains. It was cut from the same cloth as French irredentism of 1871-1914. It was re-annexionist propaganda.

Now, during the present war, after a generation of association with French life, Alsace has again been forcibly incorporated into the *Deutsches Reich*. 'Slumbering ani-



mosities have again been aroused. Robert Wagner, *gauleiter* of *Elsass*, has recently executed *Reichswehr* orders for the conscription of five classes of Alsatian youth born between 1914 and 1919 (shades of 1873!). There seems to be no doubt but that hide-bound pan-German opinion has not ceased to regard Alsace-Lorraine as irredentist territory. Nor is there anything to indicate that the Reich has recognized the distinctive character of this people, a character which can be afforded adequate expression only within the frame of political autonomy.

## Russia and Versailles

(Continued from page seventy-eight)

vantage to the Reds and placed discredit upon the Whites, especially in the eyes of their western supporters.

### *No Common Purpose*

More important was the fact that the various forces in arms against the Bolsheviks lacked a common purpose. Poland, Finland, the new-born Baltic republics and the Ukrainian nationalists, although hostile to communism, had no desire to see victory for the armies of Kolchak and Denikin, because these men sought restoration of the integrity of the Russian imperial state. The revolting nationalities of the Baltic and Ukraine wanted to dismember the empire. They refused to make military alliance with the White armies, preferring instead to look on while Russia committed suicide in civil war. In the case of Poland this attitude had near fatal results in the summer of 1920.

That year, when the communists overwhelmed their enemies, killing Kolchak and driving Denikin's forces in flight from south Russia, the Allies abandoned the White cause,—that is, quit the effort to restore Russia,—and turned to the policy of sealing Europe against Bolshevism. They attempted this by supporting Poland and drawing the Baltic states into the protective embrace of the League of Nations. Too weak to challenge this settlement, the Bolsheviks gave it recognition and retired into a political isolation broken only by conspiratorial moves against the security of the new world order raised by the victor nations of 1918.

### *Point of Failure*

Here was the weakest point in that new order. Had the Russian state been actually annihilated,—that is, forever eliminated as one of the world's great political bodies,—all might have been safe enough, with the way open for Poland to assume a Great Power role and stand guard in eastern Europe against the revival of Pan-Germanism. But Russia had not been killed; she had only been weakened and embittered. As an outcast and potential enemy of the whole organized international world, she was in standing temptation to collaborate with Germany for the overturn of the treaties of 1919-1920. The Soviet Republic played an important part in assisting the Turkish Nationalists to escape from the Treaty of Sevres, and the Russo-German treaty of Rapallo of 1922 was a plain sign that the other treaties might be upset by Russian influence. Throughout the next decade the Moscow politicians acted as saboteurs of every effort to consolidate peace in the world of 'capitalism'. They remained outside the League of Na-

tions long after Russia could have been admitted to membership. They suspected developments, such as the Locarno treaties and the Kellogg-Briand Pact of Paris, as being so many signs of conspiracy against the Soviet Republic. They fostered communism in Europe, Asia and the new world, worked to undermine the British Empire, and sought in every way to decompose organized international society beyond the frontiers of the U.S.S.R.

The result in Europe was that real security in the eastern belt reaching from the Baltic to the Danube and the Black Sea was never attained, and the way was open for Germany to smash this part of the 1919 system whenever she recovered her armed power. The refusal of the United States to join the League of Nations indicated that no strong extra-European support could be mustered for defending the Versailles order. Our isolation weakened the disposition of the British Empire to adopt a strong League policy and filled the Japanese with doubts and misgivings about their membership at Geneva. From the beginning, therefore, the organized international community and the forces of national freedom in Europe lacked the power to maintain the peace if it was broken by a resumption of the German *Drang nach Osten*. A strong Russia linked with the Western Powers in united resolve to maintain peace in both Europe and Asia was an indispensable element of world security. But instead Russia was an embittered state, at once isolationist and revisionist. Furthermore, after a few years communist activities inspired by Moscow were to supply the Nazis with their principal excuse for existence and ultimately enable them to escape from the Versailles treaty by posing as defenders of Europe against Bolshevism. The position was not unlike that which followed the Crimean war in 1856 when Russia, having been unjustly humiliated by the Western Allies, abandoned her previous conservatism in foreign policy and worked first with Bonapartist France and then with Bismarckian Prussia to overturn the political system of central Europe. That convulsion opened the way for the triumph of nationalism and *Realpolitik* in Germany and Italy: a development bearing seeds of the present Axis assault against civilized national and international politics.

### *Two Possible Solutions*

In 1919-1920 there were only two ways by which the restoration of Russia, the bringing of her into the international community and the defense of civilization against communism, might have been achieved. One was to put away fear of Moscow's strange ideology and make an earnest effort to come to some kind of working relationship with the Bolshevik republic, lending it a helping hand and striving thereby to moderate the extremists. That would have required great courage, patience and political dexterity, because the Russian revolutionaries were a dangerous set of desperados. They did not yet see that their historic task was to be the reconstruction of the fallen Russian empire rather than the inauguration of universal communist revolution. Their embrace was treacherous and to have accepted it at a moment of vast social and economic disorganization



throughout the West might have had disastrous consequences. Yet a good result might have crowned such an effort.

The other way was that of resolute support to the limit for Kolchak and Denikin in order to restore constitutional monarchy and the territorial integrity of the Russian state, minus of course an independent Poland which imperial Russia itself at the beginning of the war had promised to bring into being. This policy would have meant compelling Poles, Finns, Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians and Rumanians to meet reasonable Russian demands. Such a course, carried out in a war-weary world, would have passed beyond intelligence and courage to political genius and heroism.

Either policy could hardly have failed to produce a better result than the half-measures which neither crushed communism nor restored Russia, but only assured that communism would have a citadel for revolutionary imperialism and that Russia would be an enemy and an exile from international society. The fatal flaw in the peace of 1919 was the collapse of the bridge that spans the great divide between the West and that great Eurasian community which is surely one of the indestructible powers of the world. Not even the peril of Nazi and Japanese imperialism in the 1930s could rebuild that bridge, and if today it has been raised anew it is, as it always has been, a tenuous thing. But on such tenuous things great events and issues often have their determination.

## Prerequisite to Peace

(Continued from page seventy-six)

from the beginning for without God it could train only minds, while human wills were left to their own devices. We may some day learn that there is no human force, no motive strong enough to discipline human wills—no force save God and His law.

We were getting along so splendidly in our man-made world that God became utterly superfluous, His revelation useless. Reason could handle every problem, and those which balked its solution were dismissed as unworthy of man's time and consideration. But what was more serious still, Reason in the nineteenth century not only robbed men of God and God's providence, her pseudo-theologians soon took away God's Son and left us only a superman Christ, a wonderful character, surely, but whose word carried no more weight, no more sanction than that of Mohammed or Confucius or a dozen other religious leaders.

### Return to God

It is truly distressing that two world wars have been necessary to show men what a complete "mess" they have made of the last centuries. One such trial should have sufficed. Let us hope that it will not take a third to reduce our bullheadedness. Only one thing can save us and that one thing is a return to God, to religion, to the Christian tradition of the West.

A tremendous task faces our generation, the like of which men have never faced, save perhaps in those dark and chaotic days which followed the collapse of the civilization of the ancient Mediterranean world. In those centuries naught but man's firm adherence to the

eternal verities, nothing but his confidence in God and God's providence saw him through. We must learn by that example and hope for an even greater measure of success than was his. The return to the *status quo ante bellum* must not be our goal. It is not worth all our "blood and sweat and tears." We want a better world, but we want a world with a soul, and a soul in which God lives. Mr. Roosevelt in a remark to a South American bishop some months back put it well: "... all this war will have been fought in vain if it does not result in a re-Christianization of the world." Knowledge is not enough; we must have the will to peace.

## Copernicus

(Continued from page eighty)

his astronomical theory was ever so much more than only an astronomer. He was a great man who was an astronomer, rather than simply a great astronomer.

The Copernicus monument at Allenstein bears the inscription "Medicus, Astronomus, Clericus." Hippler, one of the biographers of Copernicus, points out "that the three oldest and surely, most authentic paintings of the Canon of the Frauenburg Cathedral, namely, the Strassburger painting, the Thorner painting and the Lemberg painting, which are so remarkably alike in presenting the facial characteristics of Copernicus, still present the three great phases of his life; for one of the paintings represents him as holding in his hand the primrose, a medicinal plant, to symbolize the physician; the other, the cross, to symbolize the cleric (we should rather say the sainted cleric); and the third, the astronomical sphere, to symbolize the astronomer." For us, Copernicus is a living reality; the personification of the ideals of scientist and religious, the embodiment of the principle that truth must be one and that science and faith both reveal to us the infinite greatness and beauty of God.

ALPHONSE M. SCHWITALLA, S.J., Ph.D.

St. Louis University

## On Usury, III

[John E. Cantwell, S. J., M. A.]

St. Louis University

XX S. Poenit. 14 aug. 1831.

Haec duo responsa—S.C.S.O. 3 julii 1822; S. Poenit 16 sept. 1830—communicata sunt a Sacra Poenitentiaria Episcopo Veronensi, qui dubia proposuerat in hac materia 14 aug. 1831, in dubiorum parte la et 4a.

... alteram et tertiam partem dubiorum, quorum Episcopus Veronensis a s. Congr. solutionem receperat.

2. Pars 1. An confessarius ille possit absolvi, qui, licet Benedicti XIV et aliorum Summorum Pontificum de usura definitiones noverit, docet ex mutuo divitibus aut negotiatoribus praestito percipi posse praeter sortem lucrum 5 pro 100 etiam ab iis qui nullum omnino alium, praeter quam legem civilem, titulum habent mutuo extrinsecum.

2. An peccet confessarius, qui dimittit in bona fide poenitentem qui ex mutuo exigit lucrum lege civili statutum absque extrinseco lucri cessantis aut damni emergentis aut periculi extraordinarii titulo.

Pars 3. Vir quidam persuasus erat Encyclicam Benedicti XIV non inhibere lucrum ex collatione pecuniae



perceptum juxta disposita a lege civili. Ejus heredes quaerunt:

1. An encyclicam recte acceperit.

2. Etiam supposito quod male acceperit, persuasus tamen recte accepisse, an heredes ab omni reparatione se exemptos existimare valeant.

Ad 2, 1. Confessarium non esse inquietandum, quousque s. Sedes definitivam decisionem emiseric, cui paratus sit se subicere etc.

2. Provisum est in precedenti, dummodo parati sint etc.

Ad 3, 1. Acquiescant, dummodo parati sint etc.

2. Provisum in primo.—B.P. p. 612.

Two previously given decrees—that of the Holy Office of July 3, 1822, and that of the Sacred Penitentiary of May 25, 1830—were sent to the Bishop of Berne in answer to the first and last of four questions which he had submitted.

The second and third questions of the bishop, and the answers were:

2. a. Can that confessor be absolved who, although he knows the definitions of Benedict XIV and other popes about usury, teaches that from a loan made to rich men or business men, there can be accepted besides the capital sum a profit of five per cent, even by those lenders who have no title whatever extrinsic to the loan except that of civil law?

b. Does that confessor commit a sin who dismisses in good faith a penitent who demands from a loan the profit established by civil law without having an extrinsic title of cessation of gain, consequent loss, or special danger (of loss of principal)?

3. A certain man was persuaded that the Encyclical of Benedict XIV did not prohibit profit made on loans of money according to the terms of the civil law. His heirs ask: a. Did he understand the Encyclical correctly? b. On the supposition that he understood it incorrectly, although he was convinced that he had the right understanding of it, can his heirs hold themselves exempt from all restitution?

Reply to 2 a. The confessor is not to be disturbed until the Holy See shall have given a definitive decision which he is ready to obey, etc.

2 b. Answered in 2 a, provided he is ready to obey, etc.

Reply to 3 a. Let them acquiesce, provided, etc. . . .

3 b. Answered in the reply to 3 a.

XXI S.C.S.O. 31 aug. 1831.

31 aug. 1831 responsum datum est Episcopo Vivariensi. Hic adverterat "in exposito Episcopi Rhedonensis nullam fieri mentionem tituli legis principis," cujus mentio occurrebat in aliis quaestionibus propositis, quibus Romanae Congregationes responderant. Quaerebat ergo:

1. An praefatum judicium ss. Pontificis (Pii VIII in resp. ad episc. Rhed.) intelligendum sit ut verba ipsius sonant et separatim a titulo legis principis, de quo eminentissimi Cardinales loquuntur in his responsis, ita ut unice agatur de mutuo negotiatoribus facto.

2. An titulus ex lege principis, de quo emm. Cardd., sic intelligendus sit, ut sufficiat legem principis declarare, licitum esse cuicumque convenire de lucro ex solo mutuo

facto, sicut fit in codice civili Francorum, quin dicat se concedere jus tale lucrum percipiendi.

In Cong. generali s. Officii etc. die 31 aug. 1831 dixerunt: Provisum in decretis 18 aug. 1830 atque dentur decreta. Ea sunt responsa data episcopo Rhedonensi.

Eadem die ss. D. N. Gregorius d.p. Papa XVI, in audientia R. D. P. Assessori s. Officii impertita, resolutionem ab Emm. captam approbavit.—B.P. p. 610; D.B.U. p. 427.

On August 31, 1831 the following reply was given to the questions of the Bishop of Vivarais who had noted that "in the decree for the Bishop of Rennes there had been no mention of the title of civil law" although this title had been mentioned in other questions which the Roman congregations had answered.

He therefore asked: 1. Whether the aforementioned decision of the Holy Pontiff is to be understood according to the plain meaning of the words and independently of the title founded on civil law of which their Eminences the Cardinals speak in their answers, so that there is question solely of a loan made to business men?

2. Whether the title founded on civil law, of which their Eminences the Cardinals speak, is so to be understood that it is sufficient for the law to declare that it is licit for anyone to contract for profit solely from a loan, as is done in the civil code of France, without the law saying that it grants the right to take such profit.

In a general session of the Cong. of the Holy Office, Aug. 31, 1831, the following reply was given: The answers to these questions are contained in the decrees of August 18, 1830. Let copies of these decrees be sent to the Bishop of Vivarais. (The decrees referred to are the answers given to the Bishop of Rennes.)

On the same day Our Holy Lord, Gregory XVI, by divine providence, pope, in an audience granted to the secretary of the Holy Office, approved the decisions of their Eminences.

XXII S.C.S.O. 31 aug. 1831.

Capitulum Locarni dubia proposuit Congr. s. Officii hoc pacto. Il capitolo di questa collegiata di Locarno, diocesi di Como, territorio svizzero, ha la maggior parte delle proprie prebende in danaro, ricavato principalmente dall'estinzione delle decime avvenuta per decreto governativo: il qual denaro egli impiegare deve, per viverne de' frutti ed adempire i pesi annessi ai benefici.

Per la circostanze de' tempi a dei luoghi, o non si trova affatto come investire il denaro suddetto in stabili fruttiferi, i quali scarseggiano assai in proporzioni della popolazione o per la carezza de' detti stabili non frutterebbe, che il due e mezzo per cento annualmente, il che peggiorerebbe eccessivamente le prebende già per se stesse meschine.

I censi si vogliono proibiti da queste leggi municipali e sono mal sicuri, non esistendo in queste parti l'ufficio del ipoteche, che accerti la libertà e sufficienza dei fondi, sui quali vogliansi stabilire. Inoltre quegli stessi, che, per fare i loro interessi, ci chiedono il danaro, ricusano ordinariamente di sottoporsi a censi e amano meglio di riceverlo a prestanza col contribuire il quattro o il cinque per cento annualmente. Cio premesso, si domanda.

1. Se la necessaria onesta sostentazione dei beneficiati, che dee provenire dal frutto dei capitali di tali prebende, è dessa un sufficiente titolo equivalente agli



altri già approvati dalla chiesa, per cui sia lecito un tale contratto di dare il danaro dotale di dette prebende a interesse del quattro o cinque per cento, dietro ipoteca di beni stabili, affine di assicurare la perpetuità del prebende.

2. Si questo titolo, supposto ammissibile, si possa estendere a favore anche delle chiese, monasteri e altri luoghi pii, come anche de' pupilli o di altre persone, che si trovano nelle circostanze medesime di sopra descritte ed hanno bisogno di far fruttare il proprio danaro, per sostenersi onestamente.

3. Si le leggi e procedure civili, che ormai approvano generalmente tali contratti e li fanno eseguire, non che il comune tacito consenso de' popoli, che per l' uso invalso de' secoli sembra li abbiano per maggior comodo e facilita sostituiti ad altri contratti pici complicati e difficili, bastino a giustificarli.

4. Se sia attendibile l'autorità del nostro Ordinario e di molti savi e dabbene ecclesiastici, che, avute di mira le circostanze suddette, opinano favorevolmente e simili contratti approvano.

5. Qual considerazione meritino in proposito le ragioni, che adduce Scipione Maffei ne' suoi tre libri *dell' Impiego del denaro*, dedicati a Benedetto XIV ed approvati dall' Inquisitor di Padova l'anno 1744.

6. Se la Bolla *de usuris* emanata dalla felice memoria di Benedetto XIV l'anno 1745 probabilmente in sequela dell' opera del Maffei al n. 3 e all' articolo *de contractu autem* e seg. si possa interpretare favorevolmente a tali contratti.

7. Supposti illeciti tali contratti, che si ha a risolvere intorno a quelli già fatti ed ai frutti già percepiti.

8. Se tali contratti si possano render leciti almeno coll' assumere il pericolo fortuito del fondo assegnato in pegno a carico della prebenda, colle dovute proposizioni, come ne' censi.

Respondit sacra Congr. Officii 31 aug. 1831.

Ad 1, 2, 3, 4 non esse inquietandos et acquiescant, dummodo parati sint stare mandatis s. Sedis.

Ad 5, 6, 7, 8, consulant encyclicam Benedicti XIV *Vix Pervenit* et probatos auctores.

Porro 7 sept. 1831 ss. D. N. Gregorius XVI in solita audientia R. P. D. Assessori s. Officii impertita Emm. resolutiones approbavit.—B.P. p. 610.

The Chapter of Locarno proposed its questions to the Congregation of the Holy Office in the following terms.

The chapter of this collegiate church of Locarno, of the diocese of Como, Switzerland, has the greater part of its prebendary revenues in cash, which is obtained principally from the liquidation of the tithes accruing to it by governmental decree. The chapter must expend this said money for living expenses and in payment of the charges connected with the benefices. On account of circumstances of time and place, either we cannot find any way to invest the money in paying real estate—this is becoming quite a bit scarce in proportion to the population—or on account of real estate prices they would not pay more than 2½% annually. This fact would greatly reduce the value of the prebends which are already so small. Interest on mortgages tends to be prohibited by our municipal laws, and mortgages are very insecure since there is no office of mortgages in this

region to secure the freedom and sufficiency of the farms which are to be mortgaged.

Furthermore, those very farmers who ask money of us in order to earn their interest, ordinarily refuse to accept interest obligations and prefer to receive money on loan with payments of 4 or 5% annually. In view of these facts it is asked:

1. Is the necessary, honest support of the beneficiati, which must be paid for by the income earned by the capital of the prebend, a sufficient title in itself, equivalent to other titles already approved by the church, so that it would be licit to make such contract as would lend the money of the said prebends at 4 or 5%, after the manner in which a mortgage is taken on real estate, for the purpose of securing the perpetuity of the prebend?

2. Can this title, on the supposition that it is permissible, be extended in favor of churches, monasteries and other pious institutions, as well as in favor of wards and other persons who are themselves in the same circumstances described above, and have need of income from their money to obtain an honest living?

3. Are the laws and civil procedures, which now generally approve such contracts and enforce their execution, sufficient to justify the contract, not to mention the tacit common consent of peoples who seem to have substituted them by immemorial custom on account of their greater convenience and ease of execution in place of other more complicated and more difficult contracts?

4. Is the authority of the bishop and that of many wise and respected ecclesiastics who, with the situation before them, think favorably of and approve of such contracts, to be given consideration as a justifying cause?

5. How much consideration is merited by the reasons which Scipio Maffei advances in his three books on *The Investment of Money*, a book dedicated to Benedict XIV and approved by the censor of Padua?

6. Can the bull "de Usuris" of Benedict XIV of happy memory, which was probably published as a result of Maffei's work, in its section No. 3 and in the paragraph "De contractu autem" and the following, be interpreted favorably to such contracts?

7. On the supposition that the contracts in question are illicit, what is to be done about such as have been already entered into, and about the interest received?

8. Are such contracts rendered licit at least by the assumption that danger might arise for the farm assigned as collateral to guarantee the prebend, with the due propositions, as is the case with regard to the collection of interest on mortgages?

The Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office replied on Aug. 31, 1831: As to questions 1, 2, 3, and 4: they are not to be disquieted, and let them acquiesce, provided they are ready to submit to any commands of the Holy See; as to questions 5, 6, 7, and 8: let them consult the encyclical letter of Benedict XIV, "Vix Pervenit" and the writings of approved authors.

Moreover, on Sept. 7, 1831, our most holy Lord, Gregory XVI, in the customary audience, granted to the reverend secretary of the Holy Office, approved the solutions of their Eminences.



## XXIII S. Poenit. 11 feb. 1832.

Die 22 jan. 1832 Joannes Antonius Avvaro regius professor retulit ad sacram Poenitentiarium primo "regiam legem pedemontanam universim et sine ulla restrictione permittere, ut quisquis alteri cuicumque pecuniam mutuat, stipulare et exigere possit annum auctarium 5 pro 100 supra sortem." Tum narratis dissensionibus theologorum qui omnes floriabantur se niti auctoritate Benedicti XIV monet, eos qui auctarium omnino usurarium et illicitum putabant, provocare solitos ad opus ejusdem Pontificis *Syn. dioces.* 1 10, c 4, n 2 and 3 qui ab haereticis repetit hanc doctrinam quod, quum agitur de mutuo, quo pecunia aliave res datur ad negotiationem a foeneris labe excusatur lucrum, quod ex mutuo percipitur, dummodo sit moderatum modumque servet a patriae legibus definitum. Atqui, aiebant, ex hac Pontificis manifesta sententia interpretari oportet ejusdem encyclicam: aliis contra pugnantibus. Quaesitum est ergo:

1. An auctarium, de quo agitur, licitum sit. Et quatenus haec questio ex doctrina Benedicti XIV aliisque judiciis Sedis Apostolicae directe resolvi nequeat;

2. An poenitentes, qui auctarium illud sive bona sive dubia aut mala fide receperunt, sacramentaliter absolvi possint, nulla facta aut promissa heic et nunc restitutione, dummodo serio promittant se esse paratos ad exsequendum quidquid super hoc negotio Sedes Apostolica determinaverit. Et quatenus affirmative;

3. An iis pariter, qui neque ullum habet titulum lucri cessantis vel damni emergentis vel periculi extraordinariis sortis amittendae neque versantur in casibus, in quibus praeceptum caritatis erga proximum eos obligat ad mutuandum simplici ac nudo mutuo, liceat pecuniam mutuo dare, stipulato aut convento annuo auctario 5 pro 100 supra sortem, prout lex regia permittit, sub eadem conditione de parendo futuris Sedis Apostolicae super hoc negotio determinationibus.

Sacra Poenitentiarium 11 feb. 1832 transmittendas censuit resolutiones alias datas ad quaedam dubia circa usuras (eae sunt quae datae sunt Episcopo Veronensi, quae et ipsae iterationes erant praecedentium.—B.P. p. 611.

On the 22 Jan. 1832 John A. Avarro, royal professor, related to the Sacred Penitentiary, first, "that the Piedmont civil law permitted, universally and without exception, that one lending money to any other could stipulate and demand an annual return of five per cent above the amount loaned." Then, giving an account of the strife among the theologians who all boasted that they based themselves on the authority of Benedict XIV, he advises that those who judge interest altogether usurious and illicit, are accustomed to cite that work of the same Pope entitled "The Diocesan Synod," 1, 10, c4, n2 and 3, which repeats the argument drawn from heretical writers that, when there is question of a loan in which money or any other object is given for business purposes, the profit that is made from the mutuum is excused from the stain of usury, provided that it is moderate and is according to the means defined by the civil law. But, they say, the encyclical of the Pontiff ought to be interpreted according to this plain statement of the Pope; others uphold the opposite side. Wherefore it is asked, 1. Is the profit of which there is question, licit? and insofar as this cannot be solved

directly from the teaching of Benedict XIV and other judgments of the Apostolic See, 2. Can penitents who accepted such profit, either in good faith, or in bad or doubtful faith, be absolved sacramentally, without any restitution made or promised here and now, provided that they seriously promise that they are ready to put into execution whatever the Apostolic See shall determine about the matter? If the answer to this question is in the affirmative, then 3. Are those who have no title from cessation of gain or consequent loss or special danger of losing the money loaned, and are not in cases in which the precept of charity toward their neighbour obliges them to make a loan according to a contract of simple mutuum—are they likewise permitted to lend money in a mutuum, with a stipulation or agreement of five per cent annual profit above the capital sum, as the civil law permits, under the like condition of obeying future determinations of the Apostolic See upon this matter?

Reply: The Sacred Penitentiary, on Feb. 11, 1832, judged that the answers given in the other cases of doubts about usury were to be forwarded to the questioner. [The answer to the Bishop of Verona which was itself a repetition of previous replies, was the document sent.]

## XXIV S.C.S.O. 17 jan. 1838.

Die 9 sept. 1837 Episcopus Nicaensis proposuit sacrae et universali Inquisitioni dubium:

An poenitentes, qui moderatum lucrum solo legis titulo ex mutuo dubia vel mala fide perceperunt, absolvi sacramentaliter possint, nullo imposito restitutionis onere, dummodo de patrato ob dubiam vel malam fidem peccato sincere doleant, et filiali obedientia parati sint stare mandatis Sanctae Sedis.

Affirmative, dummodo parati sint stare mandatis Sanctae Sedis.—B.P. p. 612; D.B.U. p. 428.

On Sept. 9, 1837 the Bishop of Nice proposed the following question to the Sacred and Universal Inquisition:

Whether penitents who, in doubtful or bad faith, take a moderate profit from a loan solely on the title of civil law, can be absolved sacramentally without being held to restitution, provided that they are sincerely sorry for the sin they committed by acting with a doubtful or evil conscience, and are prepared to obey the orders of the Holy See.

The answer: Yes, provided they are ready to obey the orders of the Holy See.

XXV S.C. 28 dec. 1838 (*Ferentina Montis Frumentarii*).

An permittendum sit augmentum, quod jamdiu percipitur, ut erogetur in dictos pios usus (nempe in conservationem templi, quod aderat in eo pauperrimo pago et in famem pauperum sustentandam in caritate annonae), seu potius reduci debeat, quantum satis sit pro expensis et conservatione Montis.

S.C. respondit: Negative ad primam partem, affirmative ad secundam et ad mentem.

Mens autem s. Cong. erat: Ut firmum maneret principium, non exigendi augmentum super mutuo datum, excepto eo, quod necessarium sit pro expensis et conservatione Montis: ut Episcopus, subductis rationibus, determinaret ratam portionem solvendam supra sortem



ob hunc titulum. Quod vero spectat ad id quod supra hanc portionem ex consuetudine jamdiu introducta percipiebatur erogandum in pios usus et nominatim in manutentionem templi pauperrimi pagi atque ad sustentandos pauperes, quoad fieri posset, in caritate annonae, posset permittere Episcopus, ut eadem consuetudo servaretur; ita tamen ut liber constitueretur, in quo distinctis titulis notarentur ratae portiones, tum eae quae ad Montem pertinerent, tum eae quae ad alios usus, ut posset cognosci quaenam sit summa, quae datur titulo iustitiae et quid recipiatur tamquam gratuita et pia oblatio. Curabit autem Episcopus, ut populus prudenti ratione certior de hac re fiat, sive ope Parochi vel alio modo, prout ipse Episcopus prudenter judicaverit.—B.P. p. 662.

Question: Ought there be permitted an excess, which has been received for a long time, to be expended for pious purposes, (i.e. the upkeep of a church in that most poverty stricken territory, and for relieving the poor in caritate annonae, or rather ought the excess be reduced to the amount necessary for the expenses and upkeep of the Mons?

The Sacred Congregation replied: To the first alternative, No; to the second alternative, Yes; and furthermore: The mind of the Sacred Congregation was: The principle of not demanding an excess over the amount loaned, except what is necessary for the expenses and upkeep of the Mons, is to be maintained. The Bishop is to determine the rate to be paid over and above the principal on this title, after examination of the matter. As regards the excess over and above the portion just described, which by long standing custom has been taken, to be used for pious purposes, specifically in maintaining a church of a most poor district, and for feeding poor people, as much as it could be done, "in caritate annonae," the Bishop could permit the custom to continue, but in such a way that an account book is set up in which the rated portions are entered under distinct titles, those which belong to the Mons and those which are devoted to other purposes, so that it could be known what was the amount given in justice and what was received as a gratuitous and pious offering. The Bishop will take care that the people are in some prudent way informed of this matter, either through the pastor or in some other manner according to his prudent judgment.

XXVI S.C.S.O. 26 mar. 1840.

Proposito dubio an ad aliquid reddendum teneatur NN. cujus pater magnam pecuniae summam mutuo dederat, cum lucro 10 pro 100 legali taxae illius temporis respondente et quatenus restitutioni esset obnoxius, utrum saltem 5 pro 100 retinere licite valeat: rescriptum fuerit:

Quoad usuras in genere consulat decreta jam lata. Quod excessivitatem fructum, consulat R. P. D. Episcopus, qui expendat facti circumstantias et praxim illius temporis, quae vigeat apud viros timoratae conscientiae et provideat.—B.P. p. 614.

To the proposed question whether NN., whose father had lent a great sum of money in a loan of mutuum at a profit of 10% according to the legal rate at that time, was bound to restore anything; and, inasfar as

he was bound to restitution, whether he could keep 5%, at least—the reply was:

"As to usuries in general let him consult the decrees already given. As to the excess of the profits let him consult his bishop who will weigh the circumstances of the act and the practice which flourished among men of good conscience at that time, and will provide the solution.

XXVII S.C. 18 aug. 1858.

18 aug. 1858 dubio proposito de lege distinguente inter interesse legale et conventionale, respondit S. C.:

Quoad fructus legales, provisum per decreta alias. Quod fructus conventionales eorumque titulos, provisum per encyclicam *Vix pervenit*. Quoad quantitatem eorum fructuum conventionalium et fructus de fructibus, rationem habendam esse in singulis casibus, habito respectu ad omnes et singulas circumstantias locorum, personarum et temporum juxta regulas a ss. Canonibus et probatis auctoribus traditas. Et dentur decreta 13 jan. 1780 et 26 mar. 1840.—B.P. p. 613.

To a doubt proposed about the law which distinguished between legal and "conventional" interest the Sacred Congregation replied: "As to the legal profits, the solution was provided by the decrees already given. As to the agreed-upon profits and the titles which justified them, the solution was contained in the encyclical "*Vix Pervenit*." As to the amount of those agreed-upon profits and as to profits from profits, an answer must be got in each individual case, by taking account of all and every circumstance of places and persons and time according to the rules given by the Sacred Canons and approved authors. Let the questioner be supplied with the decrees of 13 Jan. 1780 and 26 March 1840. XXVIII S.C.S.O. 28 feb. 1872.

Labente anno 1871 quaesitum est ex quodam Italiae loco:

1. Se sia lecito oggi eziandio agli Ecclesiastici, di collocare il denaro col frutto moderato, come permetteva la legge precedentemente sotto il legittimo governo del 5 per 100.

2. Se oggi sieno da inquietarsi quei luoghi pii, Monache e monasteri, che ricevono il frutto del loro capitale del 6 per 100; stantechè oggi si da e si riceve nell'andamento comune.

S. Cong. s. Officii die 28 feb. 1872 respondit ad utrumque: Juxta responsiones alias datas, dummodo etc, non esse inquietandos.—B.P. p. 613.

1. Is it permissible for ecclesiastics also to put out money at a moderate rate of interest, as the law formerly permitted under the legitimate ruling of five per cent; and 2. Is there reason today for disquiet on the part of those pious institutes, nuns, convents, and monasteries which receive interest on their capital at the rate of six per cent, seeing that this rate is given and received today in ordinary business transactions?

On Feb. 28, 1872 the Congr. of the Holy Office replied to both questions: In accordance with replies already given, they are not to be disturbed, provided, . . .

XXIX S.C.I. 18 dec. 1872.

Die 18 dec. 1872 responsum est litteris Vic Gener. Arianensis, quae sic se habebant:



In vista del notabile aumento delle attuali impozizioni e del maggior bisogno di rendita per sostenerle, non vi è in questa diocesi di Ariano chi voglia dare danaro a mutuo alla regione del 5 per 100 come da cotesta s. Sede vien tollerato: da molti si dà all' 8 e dal altri a norma di quanto rende il Gran Libro e cio, perchè anche la rendita, che dal mutuo si percipisce, è gravata da ricchezza mobile. Ora per badare all quiete della coscienza di tanti e per non esporre la gente al pericolo, di non più trovare chi le prestasse danaro, divenuto si scarso e ricercato ne' tempi attuali, si brama conoscere, se posse tollerarsi tal pratica o nel caso negativo, se almeno possano i confessori permettere ai loro penitenti di esigersi il 5 per 100 netto e lasciare a carico de' redditi la tassa, di cui il governo ha gravata qualsiasi rendita.

S.C.I. 18 dec. 1872 respondit: dummodo etc, non esse inquietandos.—B.P. p. 613.

On this day the S. C. replied to the following letter of the Vicar General of Ariano: In view of the notable increase of present day burdens and of the greater need of income to bear them, there is not in this diocese of Arian anyone who is willing to lend money at the rate of five per cent, as is tolerated by the Holy See. Money is loaned by many at eight per cent, and by others according to the norm of how much the "Great Book" returns them. They do this because even the revenue which is received from the loan is burdened with changeable values. Now, to provide for the peace of conscience of so many and in order not to expose the people to the danger of being no longer able to find anyone who would lend them money—it has become very scarce and is very much sought after—we desire to know whether the above described practice can be tolerated? Or, in case of a negative answer, whether confessors can at least permit penitents to demand five

per cent net and leave to their debtors the responsibility of the tax which the government has imposed on all incomes whatsoever?

Answer: They are not to be disturbed, provided, etc.

XXX *Leo XIII 16 maii 1891. Rerum Novarum.*

Malum auxit usura vorax, quae non semel Ecclesiae iudicio damnata, tamen ab hominibus avidis et quaestuosus per aliam speciem exercetur eadem: . . .

The evil has been increased by rapacious usury which, although more than once condemned by the Church, is nevertheless, under a different form but with the same guilt, still practised by avaricious and grasping men.

XXXI *Codex Juris Canonici.*

1543—Si res fungibilis ita alicui detur et ejus fiat, et postea tantundem in eodem genere restitatur, nihil lucri ratione ipsius contractus percipi potest; sed praestatione rei fungibilis non est per se illicitum de lucro legali pascisci, nisi constet ipsum esse immoderatum, aut etiam de lucro majore si justus ac proportionatus titulus suffragetur.

*The Code of Canon Law.*

Canon 1543. If goods are loaned which are consumed by use in such a manner that the other becomes at once the owner and they are to be returned by goods of the same kind, (a contract which the theologians call "mutuum") nothing can be asked by reason of the contract itself; in an ordinary loan, however, of goods which are consumed by use it is not in itself unlawful to make an agreement for legal interest, unless the interest is too high; but agreement for higher interest than the law allows may be made if there is a just and proportionate reason for such a demand.—The New Canon Law, S. Woywood, O.F.M., Wagner, New York.

## Recent Books in Review

*A History of Historical Writing*, by James Westfall Thompson, with the collaboration of Bernard J. Holm. 2 Vol. New York. Macmillan Co. 1942. pp. 676 and 674. \$14.00

In the ordinary way of reckoning it probably takes more than two volumes to win the title, "a monumental work"; but in this present instance such a mead of praise is well deserved. Mr. Thompson closed his half century of historical productivity with a truly monumental work. It is unfortunate that Death did not allow him a few more months of life that he might see this last of his works off the press, for this is in many respects the finest of a long list of noteworthy contributions to historical scholarship. The task of seeing the study through its final stages fell to the lot of a young friend and research associate whom Mr. Thompson esteemed highly and in whose hands he knew that he could trust a work which meant very much to him. Mr. Bernard J. Holm was the last of a long line of Thompson doctors. He had contributed much, in the way of detail, bibliographical checking, and the like, during those last years, when, after Mr. Thompson became emeritus, failing health robbed him of much of his wonted energy and enormous productive capacity. The recognition given this young professor is as much a tribute to the master as it most certainly is to the former student.

The *History of Historical Writing* is in a very real sense an intellectual biography of Thompson the historian. Its vast erudition, its thoroughness, its incisive views, and even its occasional prejudices tell us much of the writer and show us

who knew and esteemed him, and betimes disagreed with him, how he came to be what he was, one of our leading historical scholars. The Middle Ages was his field of special predilection, but his interest in the development of the West was by no means bounded by the Fall of the Roman Empire and the Renaissance — the present work is convincing evidence. As might be expected, in commenting on medieval writers more than once a special love gleams through the lines — observations on Gregory of Tours form a case in point, but there are many others. Many of the "moderns" Thompson knew not only in their works but personally as well — this reviewer can remember more than one informal session when Thompson entertained with observations and anecdotes on his friends and acquaintances among History's "greats" and enthused and inspired us with these same examples.

He was a fine teacher — to open a short paragraph which may not seem too relevant in a book review. One thing which clouded his days in the early months of 1939, the year of his retirement, as Spring rolled by was the fact that each minute was bringing him distressingly closer to the end of one phase of his historian's career which was especially dear to him. He had no desire for the distinction of "Emeritus," even though it might bring with it precious time to devote to projects, as the present, which press of teaching and graduate direction had forced him to postpone. This sincere interest in and devotion to his students did not always appear on the surface. One never really got to know Thompson in the formality of the classroom; at the seminar table and in his study, however, esteem for his scholarship blossomed into friendship for the man.

Thompson was a product, once removed, of the Ranke school



of German historical scholarship which he so brilliantly describes in the second volume of this work. This fact helped to give him many of his idols, his models, and his ideals, and also some of his viewpoints. The reader of the present study can see how he came to hold certain ideas and to assume certain attitudes which conflicted strangely with the fairness, both meticulous and broad, which generally characterized his outlook. A case in point would be his treatment of the papacy—he was never quite able to rise above a Ghibelline partisanship which grew out of sincere admiration for the medieval German emperors and, undoubtedly, was reinforced by the Liberalism of his German "masters" of the nineteenth century.

The sweep of this work is, perhaps, its most marked characteristic. From the earliest beginnings of history in the Ancient Orient down to very recent times the story of the Historiography of the West rolls along. The author's concept of the West is confined to Europe, a fact which gives rise to one of the minor disappointments to the reader, that of finding no mention of American historians of Europe. Mr. Thompson, of course, informs us in the Preface that this will be the case. He has also chosen, and wisely, to exclude historians not yet deceased. If there are exclusions, there are also inclusions of great value, as for instance the chapter on the Syrian and Armenian historians of the Crusades, the several on Byzantine and other Eastern writers, and the treatment given to the scholars of the so-called "Minor Countries of Europe," so often disregarded.

In the evaluation of this host of historians one is bound to find opinions with which he will not agree. And it is inevitable that there will be times when it is felt that undue emphasis is given to one or other, as well as undeserved criticism. Let one example of disagreement suffice: Catholics will, and with perfect justice, loudly protest the inclusion of Ernest Renan among the Catholic historians of the Nineteenth Century.

However, by and large and with all things taken into consideration, Mr. Thompson has made a real contribution to historiography. This reviewer feels that the medieval section is by far the soundest, but such a statement is not meant by way of detracting from the many other excellent sections of the work. The vast amount of bibliographical material contained in the footnotes is itself invaluable.

JOHN F. BANNON

## Church History

**Second Sowing**, by Margaret Williams. New York. Sheed and Ward. 1942. pp. 495. \$3.50

*Second Sowing* is the intensely interesting story of the life of Mother Aloysia Hardy and of the founding of the Convents of the Sacred Heart in America. Born December 8, 1809, in Maryland, Aloysia moved to Louisiana with her parents, when she was seven years old. In 1821 Blessed Philippine Duchesne made the second foundation of the Society of the Sacred Heart in North America at Grand Coteau, Louisiana—a town about two hundred miles northwest of New Orleans. Aloysia was among the first pupils of this foundation and remained there until she was sixteen. At that age she entered the novitiate. Her great tact and gracious manner were noted by her superiors, and it was not long after her profession that she became Mistress General, Treasurer, Assistant Superior and finally Superior at St. Michael's in Louisiana, sixty miles above New Orleans, the Society's third foundation in America. Mother Hardy proved more than equal to these responsibilities. In later years she founded convents in New York, Buffalo, Philadelphia, Rochester, Detroit, Cincinnati, Albany, Boston, Atlantic City, in Canada, Mexico, and Cuba. A few of these houses have been closed, but the majority of them remain as monuments to Reverend Mother Hardy's untiring zeal.

This biography is exceptionally well written. The author fully appreciates the qualities that made Mother Hardy a truly representative religious of the Sacred Heart, and paints a warm and human picture of a Mother Superior whose great faith in God and in the power of prayer, together with her winning charm of manner, enabled her to accomplish great things for the honor and glory of the Sacred Heart.

ISABELLE R. KENNEDY

**The House on Humility Street**, by Martin W. Doherty. New York. Longmans, Green. 1942. pp. 269. \$3.00

In these memories of the North American College in Rome Father Marty Doherty has done splendid service to the college,

to its alumni, to his readers. To the college he has paid a glowing debt of gratitude by capturing its spirit and charm in its life and traditions to conserve them through time. To its alumni his memories re-create the mellowed past in musing recollection, and reach hope into the future that the same spirit and traditions will live again in the Collegio Americano after the war. This latter is a real service to the future students of the Del Nord, who will wish to cherish and relive the unbroken tradition of three-quarters of a century. To his readers, finally, Father Marty affords a fascinating acquaintance with the real Del Nord, with the real Rome—to know them from within.

True, his Roman sojourn measures perhaps just a year, but it sufficed for his appreciation to divine the reality. His impressions are true: for instance, the initial disappointment in the homeliness of the city and the college—that was the body; but in time he knew the soul, the spirit that vivified and immortalized and beautified that body. The homely and the humble it was that sowed the seed of revering love in his heart and memory—the crooked narrow streets, the plain drab buildings, the poor simple folk . . . a city poor but a City Eternal.

In weaving the variegated pattern of his memories and musings, the author reveals the warp and woof of any genuine revelation of the Eternal City: the Fatherhood of the Pope, and the Motherhood of the Church . . . the sum total of all one's impressions of Rome. He knew the Pope and loved him; he knew the Church and loved her; so Rome is enshrined in his heart.

The previous journalistic experience of Father Doherty as a police reporter in Chicago (of the same family as his brother Eddie Doherty of "Gall and Honey" fame) accounts for his facility and the interest he sustains throughout the book, informative, humorous, entertaining, and reverent. Ingenuously and effortlessly he explains the incidental points of Catholic faith and practice, rendering his account readable and intelligible to readers non-Catholic.

We are grateful to him for his fine work.

G. J. KAISER

**A Prophet and a Pilgrim**, by Herbert W. Schneider and George Lawton. New York. Columbia University Press. 1942. pp. xviii + 589. \$5.00

This book tells the life story of two men Thomas Lake Harris and Laurence Oliphant. They established, headed rather strictly utopian communities—The Brotherhood of the New Life. Harris was the original founder. Oliphant defected from his obedience and went on his own. That was in 1881. Harris, the "pivotal man" on whom and through whom all revelation and interpretation must be founded and derived, would not, or could not brook a rival.

"The Brotherhood of the New Life"—to quote the authors—"resembled other better-known expressions of mysticism in two respects: it was a revolt from the church (that of Swedenborg) for the purpose of founding a theocratic community; and it was built on an elaboration of the mythology of sex."

The authors profess to tell an objective tale and not to judge the phenomena they describe. They candidly admit that they could not get the key that would unlock the strange people and the stranger writings which they so painstakingly and clearly put before their readers; and they leave the interpretation and the judgment on the men involved and on the doctrines cited to their readers.

The movement, obviously, was but one of the many that have been seen in the world. It was but one of the many that have had their day in these United States.

The book, therefore, is a contribution to the study of weird religious phenomena. There is, however, a patent danger for the novice reader in such literature; true mysticism and false are not easily distinguished. Today, when the Freudian forms seem to dominate so much of men's thinking about religion, the unwary or the one-sidedly-informed may fall into the snare that St. Augustine with his sharp and crushing criticisms of "some forms of religious worship and belief" did not fall victim to; but into which Freud, with his lesser knowledge and his so extravagantly one-sided knowledge of all that was worst in religion, did definitely commit himself to.

Augustine reasoned that some forms of religion were superstitious, and so were pernicious nonsense; Freud reasoned that all forms of religion were superstitious and so were pernicious nonsense! "A little knowledge is a dangerous thing!"

ROBERT B. MORRISON



## Ancient History

**Constantine the Great**, by Lloyd B. Holsapple. New York. Sheed and Ward. 1942. pp. xix + 475. \$3.00

Uppermost in one's mind after finishing this study of Europe's first Christian emperor is the thought that it is a masterful reconstruction of the true genius of Constantine. I say masterful designedly, and that for several reasons. The ground covered in this book is one that has been reworked so often that it threatens to be rather barren for further consideration. But not so in Dr. Holsapple's masterful hands.

In the first place, he does not impose upon his readers' historical sense by an abrupt introduction to Constantine. Instead, with graphic strokes he gradually depicts the background into which he will place Constantine, setting forth the crying economic and political evils of the Roman Empire. Then Constantine himself is skillfully molded right out of that background so that the result makes a neat bas-relief showing how Constantine remedies these evils. This clean-cut presentation is due to an unusually penetrating insight into the psychology of character which the author brings to his task. This is the second reason why the work is not barren but masterful. This ability to analyze character is of distinct advantage in piercing through the tangled fabric of legend, distorted history and panegyric which inevitably masks the true personality of such a genius as Constantine.

The contents of the book are adequate for their purpose. They take Constantine from the day he stood as a youth on the hill outside of Nicomedia as he watched a pretender receive the title of Caesar which he rightly deserved, through his military exploits in Gaul with his father, on to his conversion and the many steps he took to bring the Church into favor in the empire and still further on through his moving of the old Rome to the new on the Bosphorus, until they finally show him in the midst of his economic and social reforms.

Every page of the work gives ample evidence of Dr. Holsapple's keen historical sense in the cautiousness of his judgments after setting forth all the available evidence. Thereby he has been able to cut through the particular biases of the historians of the times and arrive at conclusions which are never wider than the evidence warrants, giving to historians as well as to interested laymen a masterful work which does full justice to the heroic stature of Constantine.

ROBERT F. MCENIRY

**The Pretorian Prefect from Commodus to Diocletian (A.D. 180-305)**, by Laurence Lee Howe. Chicago. The University of Chicago Press. 1942. pp. xiv + 141. \$2.00

This learned study considers the position of the Pretorian prefect at the end of the second century, the military powers, the civil powers, the history and influence of the pretorian prefect: this merely by glancing at the chapter headings.

The two fundamental oppositions of the Roman Empire were justice and despotism. The pretorian prefects of the third century exhibited both extremes. This partly accounts for the fascination those times have for modern readers, and for the readability of this book, the readability especially of chapter five, "History and Influence of the Prefecture." In the last paragraph of this chapter Mr. Howe writes, "Like their emperors some of the prefects were good men, while others were bad; but, also like their emperors, they were mostly competent." Important names are found in the lists: those of Ulpian and Papinian, the jurist-prefects, Timesitheus, Ballista.

In the first part of the period under consideration lived jurists, two or three of whom were pretorian prefects, who helped and justified the emperor in making laws, Ulpian and Papinian for example. Due to the influence of the jurists two tendencies are seen during the remainder of the third century: the increase in centralized authority, and a corollary, the duty of the emperor to "see to it that the people suffer no wrong" (p. 44). Thenceforth interpretation of the laws was generally milder and more humane. When these jurist-prefects and other prefects were good "they were the ears and eyes of conscientious rulers . . . they were the right arms of valiant princes . . ." (p. 63).

CARL CHAMBERLAIN

## European History

**Medieval Europe**, by Jeremiah O'Sullivan and John F. Burns. New York. F. S. Crofts & Co. 1943. pp. xi + 770. \$4.00

This volume on medieval history is an excellent contribution to that field. Few surveys of the period under treatment are better than *Medieval Europe* in wealth of detail, numerous references to prime sources, and completeness within a brief scope. It has been a pressing need to produce a college text that cites references to primary sources and makes constant use of them. The authors are very definitely to be congratulated in bringing in so many sources usually passed over or thought too "dusty" for a college course. These sources do not detract from but rather add to a student's interest if the references are available.

Many different approaches to the problems of the Middle Ages are attempted with success and the summaries in the beginning of units and again at the end, give the necessary fundamentals whether of definition or orientation to the subject approached.

The treatment of monasticism, feudalism, the advance and growth of Islam and the discussion on the arts is very complete for such a survey. In discussing philosophical trends, however, it is with regret that we note the lack of emphasis on the greatest philosopher of the period—St. Thomas. A more complete knowledge of the Angelic Doctor is essential to an understanding of his age and the succeeding ones, but although there is systematic treatment of Scotus, Erigena, Roscelin, Anselm, Abelard, etc. and what they held, with their influence, the emphasis would seem to be ill-placed with reference to Thomas. He was great, but why? Reasons were given for the others; why not for the man who is the perfect expression of the spirit of the Middle Ages at its height? Perhaps this was an oversight and the reviewer may expect too much, but this point does detract from an otherwise valuable text book.

J. J. CAMPBELL

**Social Theories of The Middle Ages — 1200-1500**, by Bede Jarrett, O. P. The Newman Book Shop. Westminster, Maryland. 1942. pp. ix + 280.

This second printing of Bede Jarrett's scholarly treatment of the main institutions in the social structure of the high Middle Ages will be enthusiastically welcomed by the students of medieval history who have not already perused this work. The author's intimate acquaintance as a Dominican with the comprehensive works of the Angelic Doctor of his order has increased the value and merit of this book.

The nine institutions—law, education, women, slavery, property, money-making, war, Christendom, and art—which are treated in as many chapters, are well chosen and present to the reader a detailed picture of society in those three important centuries. Much human interest is given the book by the well chosen quotations from contemporary sources which describe clearly the educational ideals, the status of women in society, and the lot of the slave.

In presentation of matter this book is so written as to give even the chance reader an appreciation of those ages long passed. On the other hand, the numerous references to primary sources make the work invaluable to the more advanced student.

Father Jarrett's membership in the order which was one of the lights of the ages about which he writes gives him a deep interest in the preservation of the heritage handed down to him. In this book he has tried to do his part to hand this heritage on to others.

E. J. KURTH

**Siberia**, by Emil Lengyel. New York. Random House. 1943. pp. xiii + 416. \$3.75

To those who are still laboring under the delusion that Siberia is an ice-locked cenotaph of no importance—the land of the living dead, the polar bear and the thundering *purga*—Lengyel's popular historical sketch will come as a surprise. True, Siberia, under the Tsars, was much like that. Up until the twentieth century, it was the stepchild of the Empire. Other than the construction of the Trans-Siberian Railroad, a military project, and the inauguration of desultory colonization schemes, little was done for the country. Siberia was left to its backward native population, shunned by all save the wretched peasantry who sometimes fled to it in desperation. At best it was a wilderness into which adventured the wild spirit of ferment, the restless cossacks, or it was a prison without walls to which were sent exiled revolutionaries. At worst the land was a dungeon where men worked like moles in the fearful mines of mercury or the pitiless gold diggings at Nerchinsk. Today there is a different tale to tell. Migrants still move into this land, and in greater streams than ever before, but no longer in desperation or under compulsion.

Soviet Asia, of which Siberia is only a part is almost two and



one half times the size of the United States. Its population now numbers more than 43,000,000. This revolutionized "heartland," an invincible natural bastion, is a land of astonishing contrasts. The cold pole of the world, where a temperature of  $-95^{\circ}$  Fahrenheit has been recorded, centers around Verkoyansk; yet the traveller may meet with unbearable heat and temperatures up to  $150^{\circ}$  on the deserts of Turkmenistan. Scenery varies from the dismal tundra of the Arctic shores to the Shangri-La valleys with sub-tropical vegetation between the snow capped peaks of Pamir, the rooftop of the world. The country possesses all the raw materials necessary "to secure supremacy of the peninsula called Europe". Lengyel, like Davies and Steiger in their work, *Soviet Asia: Democracy's First Line of Defense*, predicts that Siberia will be the "Golden East" of tomorrow.

The general reading public will find Mr. Lengyel's historical narrative entertaining and informative. The author's style is simple and lucid; yet he writes with the vivacity and color of a 'top-notch' foreign news correspondent. He has, himself, in the course of an adventurous life time, thrice visited the land whereof he writes.

WILLIAM HARVEY MAEHL

## American History

*A Latin American Speaks*, by Luis Quintanilla. New York. Macmillan. 1943. pp. 268. \$2.50

The author's own opening sentences sound the keynote of this interesting book: "This is not a book written by one American on the other America. It is a book on America, by an American." He tries to make it precisely that, and in a sense succeeds rather well. Perhaps not all of his fellow Latins will agree with all his views, nor are all Anglos likely to do so either. Nevertheless Señor Quintanilla has given the one and the other something to think about by manifesting himself as one American at least who can feel and express himself in hemispheric terms.

The study has many fine qualities. The penetrating analysis of the Latin and the Anglo is excellent, and the point of mutual misunderstanding and misinterpretation most enlightening. The section "Inter-America," which contains an enthusiastic presentation of Bolívar's dreams of hemispheric unity and solidarity, a well deserved condemnation of certain self-interested types of Pan-Americanism, a shrewd portrayal of the role of inter-American trade relationships making for unity, and finally a sympathetic evaluation of the Good Neighbor effort, is by far the soundest section of the book. When, as an American and a democrat, Señor Quintanilla hurls a challenge at Democracy's enemies, he is at times more eloquent than logical. His espousal of the Socialist answer to the world's problems will not find acceptance in many quarters both North and South. Yet, even with its faults, the book is stimulating fare for thoughtful minds, and, as such, a contribution to Pan-American literature. The author composed his study in English and is to be congratulated for his splendid, literary grasp of our North American idiom.

JOHN F. BANNON

*Old Man River*, by Robert A. Hereford. Caldwell. Caxton. 1943. pp. 301. \$3.50

There may be bigger rivers in the world, and I believe there are, and there may be rivers that have exercised a wider historic importance. That little creek called the Tiber did. And I suppose the Seine once on a time was historically more important. But few rivers have the glamour and the historic fascination that we find in our own Mississippi.

Bob Hereford caught a glimpse of all this when he met the old river pilot who was the hero of his book and caught the old man's stories before he stopped telling them in this world. For thrilling stories of the Mississippi in the days of the Civil War and after, for the historic viewpoint of a man who saw the river fade in commercial importance, for the colorful history of a bygone romantic era, I can well recommend *Old Man River*. Historically it seems to be amazingly accurate, for Mr. Hereford buttressed the remembrances of the pilot with a great deal of his own personal reading, research, and study.

I could wish that more history were as fascinating and that more fiction were as graphic and picturesque as this story of life on the big river.

DANIEL A. LORD

*The Wisconsin*, by August Derleth. New York. Farrar and Rinehart. 1942. pp. xi + 366. \$2.50

In an enjoyable and entertaining way, Mr. Derleth has unfolded before his readers the Wisconsin River. He seems to

have let no point of interest, either historical or geographical, that may add to the charm of the northern river, lie idle.

And yet, the book does not read like a chronicle of events and points of interest. Disputes as to the first white man to gaze on the Wisconsin, and early accounts of Craver and Marrayt, arouse interesting speculations on the origin of the name of the river.

The Black Hawk War is given in a rather complete and picturesque story of the Great Indian Chief. Realistic details of frontier life are well placed in Mrs. Kinzie's own words.

Famous men all find their places in the story. There are Father Mazzuchelli, Hercules Dausman, Count Haraszthy, Turner, the historian, Ringling Brothers, the circus men, and the inventor, Appleby. Local color is heightened by the humorous controversy of the two cities on the Sauk Prairie, and the tall tales and ballads of the woodsmen, including the Hodag hoax and the "cousin Jack" stories.

Had the writer added a few maps, especially when dealing with the advent of early explorers and settlers, and again in the descriptions of Black Hawk and the soldiers, such parts would have been clearer. The picture map, while serving no constructive purpose in the make-up of the book, is interesting. The illustrations are very good and fit the book well.

R. P. NEENAN.

*Land Hunger*: David L. Payne and the Oklahoma Boomers, by Carl Coke Rister. University of Oklahoma Press. pp. xiii + 245. \$2.75

This book details the biography of David L. Payne, whose life, because it was so dedicated to the Boomer cause, portrays one of the most exciting episodes in American frontier history, the opening of the Indian Territory to settlement, and eventually to the formation of the State of Oklahoma.

Payne's interest in the West was early aroused through stories he heard from travelers. When a young man, he became a frontiersman. He became interested and interested others in the colonization of Oklahoma. Thus the name Boomers means Oklahoma-bound emigrants. The experience he had acquired as a frontiersman stood him in good stead when he led the members of his Oklahoma Colony westward. The Five Civilized Tribes, however, plus the cattlemen and the federal government offered real opposition. After a ten year struggle the long fight ended in a posthumous victory for Payne, because in 1889 the government allowed homesteaders to enter the former Indian Territory. The defeats, hardships, sufferings, and hopes that played a part in Payne's life make a very interesting story.

Mr. Rister has succeeded through a conversational style in portraying Payne as he undoubtedly was: a son of the plains, resourceful, bold, fluent in conversation, with the virtues and vices of one bred in the atmosphere of a raw and exacting frontier.

I would recommend this book especially to teachers of American history in high school.

RICHARD S. CROWLEY

*A Short History of Canada for Americans*, by Alfred Leroy Burt. Minneapolis. University of Minnesota Press. 1942. pp. xvi + 269. \$3.00

"Canada is so close and yet so far away from me. I know less about it than almost any other place in the world." This was the typical answer offered by the twelve hundred students when quizzed by President Hauck of the University of Maine concerning their knowledge of Canada. We are grateful to Professor Burt for his worthy contribution, which, we feel sure, will help to eliminate this widespread ignorance of Canadian historiography.

The book is what the title suggests: *A Short History of Canada for Americans*. The author, a Canadian by birth, discusses the major developments in Canada from its establishment to its entrance into World War II, always, however with special reference to her neighbor to the south. He gives a new meaning to the American Revolution, the War of 1812, Quebec Act, defeat of Burgoyne, and the treaty of 1783. The work of the Church and especially the Jesuits in the formation of New France is justly evaluated.

It is a real pleasure whenever we find that rare combination of scholarly historian and popular stylist. We have just such a happy combination in Professor Burt.

J. J. SCHLAFLY



**Builders of Latin America**, by Watt Stewart and Harold F. Peterson. New York. Harper and Brothers, 1942. pp. 304. \$2.50

This little work is an attempt to popularize and to bring to the acquaintance of the *Norteamericano*, some of the principal figures in Latin American history. In a certain sense it is successful. It might have been more so, had the choice of subjects for the short biographical sketches been chosen more judiciously and had there been a more careful sifting of the secondary materials from which the work is built. The book is interestingly illustrated with pictures of a number of Latin American places, persons, and things. In this respect, however, a photograph or portrait of the subject of the sketch might have been more apropos than some of the pictures chosen, excellent though these last may be. On the whole this reviewer must confess that he found the book a bit disappointing.

JOHN F. BANNON

**Decisive Battles of the U.S.A.**, by Major-General J. F. C. Fuller. New York. Harper. 1942. pp. xi + 416. \$4.00

General Fuller has earned by his latest book not only our praise but also our gratitude. Praise, certainly, is due him for what is a handy presentation of the best in American military history. We owe him our gratitude, too, for his fine sense of this country's military past. Written in England and, as the author says, often amid the crash of bombs, this book has been more than usually successful in reaching an American point of view. Eleven chapters take us from the Revolution through 1812 and the war with Mexico, through several battles of the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, and up to the decisive battle of the Meuse-Argonne. Perhaps the chapter on Trenton is his best example of compact, yet adequate narrative. Sherman's Atlanta campaign is another example of concise, yet full treatment. Only occasionally, as in the battle of Chattanooga and in the Spanish-American War, is there evidence of less unity. Chief among other praiseworthy additions are the brief, inter-capital synopses of the events which followed upon and led up to each conflict. Slips in accuracy hardly amount to more than the ambiguous use of a name. For example, it is not clear that the Jeff. Davis whom Sherman blames for the destruction in his famous march was the Confederate President rather than a Union general of the same name.

The author makes many thought-provoking comparisons that will linger in the reader's mind. At this time of boasted efficiency in war-making, it is interesting to see the Civil War described as a "war of astonishing modernity," and Sherman described as the "first of the modern totalitarian generals." Finally, a generous number of maps and plans and an ample index make this a very useful book for both layman and student.

W. J. KOCH

## Modern History

**Christian Crisis**, by Michael de la Bedoyere. New York. Macmillan Co. 1942. pp. xiii, 210. \$2.00

One who would read this book hastily might vaguely grasp its general thesis, but he would do both the author and himself an injustice; for this book contains a truly searching study. It combines two highly commendable characteristics: it is exceptionally informative and challenging.

Michael de la Bedoyere is a prominent English Catholic and journalist, with the word "prominent" qualifying in its finest sense both "Catholic" and "journalist." He understands his Faith in a thorough and appreciative manner; he is a journalist who writes with clarity, strength and conviction. That he has followed and grasps contemporary national and international trends is more than evident on every page of the present work. His various analyses, constructive criticisms and solutions are practical and courageous; they are permeated with a zeal that borders on the apostolic.

The book is divided into two sections entitled: "Yesterday"—"Today." The first presents the problem: "The time has come to face and answer the question: Shall Christianity be taken seriously—by Christians as well as non-Christians? Or shall it be left as a personal faith for those who happen to find comfort in its teaching?" Then there follows an enlightening exposition of the role assumed by Christianity (generally through force of circumstances, but in some instances through imprudence, lack of foresight or weakness), during the last war and the generation of simulated peace which followed. A good chapter is devoted to Socialism and another to Nationalism, while a third describes a philosophy of life, a religion or a frame of mind for

which the author coins the word "Dawnism." He uses it to supplant the older and ambiguous term "Liberalism." It is "Dawnism" that evoked the Syllabus of Pius IX.

The section bearing the heading "To-day," while largely directed to British Catholics and their particular problems and duties, is by no means inapplicable to Americans. His final judgment is far from pessimistic; on the contrary, it is decidedly encouraging should Catholics and sincere Christians realize their power as well as their responsibility. "There are three hundred million Catholics and many millions of non-Catholic Christians, retaining the essence of Christianity; in every Western country Christianity still exists as an organized institution, still the acknowledged religious and spiritual force of the country; outside the body of Christians there are millions who seek precisely what Christianity as a social and moral force teaches, millions who, disillusioned with the ideologies they have followed, are more than ready to listen to a Christian leadership which they can respect when they can discern it, understand it and see it in terms of their own best desires. Is it impossible to translate all this into action?"

P. J. HOLLORAN

**The Making of Tomorrow**, by Raoul de Roussy de Sales. New York. Reynal & Hitchcock. 1942. pp. viii + 340. \$2.50

The analysis of nationalism, collectivism, democracy and their contrasted effects in Europe and America makes up the principal part of *The Making of Tomorrow*; and although such an analysis must be brief to be contained in one volume, the high points and distinguishing characteristics are clearly and plainly marked and easily grasped. The author is well acquainted with his field and gives us no rash conclusions or long-range prophecies that cannot be wrong. He admits that many of his statements may not be agreed with and may not be considered after the war or may have been proven wrong.

In the fourth part of *The Making of Tomorrow* the characteristic marks of American democracy are given, but in the opinion of the reviewer it is feared that such distinguishing and dominant characteristics as "the goodness of man," and "the people express the will of God," as they are developed by Mr. de Sales, would leave little room for approval by those who recall and know the encyclical of Pope Leo XIII on *The Christian Constitution of States*. Such ideas are expressly condemned in almost the exact words as given above.

Also we would call emphatically into question this statement on pages 215-16: "For them—and more especially for those living before the Renaissance—the notion of the future was meaningless in terms of progress or happiness. The grim dogma of Original Sin permeated all thinking. Man was born wicked and his only hope was for a better life after death. There was no concept that man considered as an individual, or as a succession of generations could improve his lot on this planet." To the student of medieval history, the very antithesis of the above quoted opinion is true.

J. J. CAMPBELL

**School of the Citizen-Soldier**, edited by Colonel Robert A. Griffin. New York. D. Appleton-Century Company. 1942. pp. xvii + 558. \$2.40

*School of the Citizen Soldier* is adapted from the Educational Program of the Second Army. The Program, which arose from a concern over the general lack of comprehension among the soldiers of the stakes involved in World War II and of other matters necessary for an understanding of present day world events, was conceived and put into effect at the direction of the Army Commander, Lieutenant General Ben Lear. The purpose of the program is, "to make clear not why we are fighting but for what we are fighting . . . to develop the mental background of the soldier and add to his capacity to think for himself, clearly and honestly."

The style of the lecture room has been preserved throughout which lends interest and color. As a whole it is a good indication of what the Army is doing in a positive way to create better citizens for, "the uniform should not be an insulation against mental activity that isn't directly military."

In making the work available to the public the editors hope to achieve a success similar to the one that has been realized from the course of lectures given to the soldiers; so that more may come to realize what those material and spiritual things are for which men are fighting and dying today to keep alive.

FRANCIS X. NAWN



## Economics and Sociology

**The Standard of Living in 1860—American Consumption Levels on the Eve of the Civil War**, by Edgar W. Martin. Chicago. University of Chicago Press. 1942. pp. 451. \$4.50

Good books are often hard to review and this is a good book. Dr. Martin has sought to apply Heckscher's severe but inclusive standards on quantitative economic history to American social life on the eve of that great turning point in our history, the Civil War. To say that he has succeeded would be too mild praise. From a wide range of sources, from census report to frontier diaries he has collected items, all in dollar terms, on food, both production and domestic use, on the household, the cost of the structure, operation and maintenance, medical care and public health, travel, transport and communication, government and philanthropy, religion, culture and education, leisure and recreation. Perhaps the most striking difference between then and now was the place for taxes in the budget. Fifty dollars was 'good annual savings'; six hundred dollars a good income. Most industrial employees made from two hundred and fifty to four hundred dollars a year; professional men made two thousand in the large centers, one thousand elsewhere.

The pitfalls of the purely quantitative method are shown by taking average value of church property as a 'good clue to the economic status of their members'; this method puts the Catholics in the highest economic status, a conclusion borne out by no other evidence. Likewise to take seating capacity as an index of church membership is a slender statistical reed on which to lean. But these lapses are indicative of the weakness of a general method and not of Dr. Martin's work which deserves strongest commendation as do also Professors Wright and Nef who inspired and directed it.

BERNARD W. DEMPSEY

**The Negro in Colonial New England, 1620-1776**, by Lorenzo Johnston Greene; New York. Columbia University Press. 1942. pp. 404. \$4.50

Students should welcome this scholarly contribution to Colonial New England history. The deeply significant repercussions of slavery on the social, economic, and political life of the Puritan colonies is interestingly expressed, adequately demonstrated, and copiously substantiated by the evidences of thorough research and scholarly knowledge of facts. With this first complete study of the Negro in Colonial New England, Dr. Greene has filled a long neglected gap in our knowledge of Negro life in the United States.

Any student of this subject will find invaluable assistance in the author's twenty-three pages of bibliography, of which thirteen pages contain primary sources. Aside from a somewhat choppy style in the early chapters, due to countless documentary quotations, the book is well written and pleasant. The addition of a good summary, illustrative tables, and an index, give the work a tone of completeness.

THOMAS F. THRO

**Bartolus on Social Conditions in the Fourteenth Century**, by Anna T. Sheedy, Ph. D. New York. Columbia University Press. 1942. pp. 267. \$3.25

"This study has evolved from an examination of the writings of Bartolus of Sassoferrato for information regarding certain aspects of social life in fourteenth century Italy." Dr. Sheedy, in prefacing her work with this sentence, has characterized it accurately: it is a concise and orderly compilation of such knowledge of fourteenth-century Italian society as one can glean from a careful study of the writings of the great exponent of Roman Law.

The chapter headings indicate the phases of society treated. Besides an introductory chapter on Bartolus himself, they are "The Family," "The City," "Nobles and Nobility," "Students and Doctors," "The Sentiment of Religion," "Franciscan Poverty," and "Heretics and Jews." Different readers will naturally be interested in different chapters, but I would recommend two in particular. In "The Sentiment of Religion," despite its rather ill-chosen title, factual evidence is furnished for the uniquely Catholic spirit of the age; and in "The City" the student of political theory will find Bartolus' doctrine on tyranny, as well as a useful account of the government of a free city in the Italy of the thirteenth century. Also worthy of mention is the acquaintance with the mind of Bartolus which one makes while reading this book, for his mind was acknowledged to be the greatest among the Civilists for more than a century after his death in 1357.

Since Bartolus was a jurist, concerned with legal principles rather than with sociological data, one cannot hope to draw a complete or balanced picture of his age from his works, nor does the author attempt to do so. Her purpose is only to lay before the reader the materials that can be furnished from this source for such a picture, and to evaluate them. The evaluation is given briefly for the most part, but manifests sound scholarship and dispassionate judgment; there is no propaganda here either for or against the Middle Ages. Because of the legal nature of the subject matter and the comparative paucity of Dr. Sheedy's own comment and interpretation, the work does not make fascinating reading, and hence will appeal more to the serious student of the period than to one seeking general knowledge or reading for diversion.

FRANCIS CANAVAN

## Medieval Europe

JEREMIAH O'SULLIVAN, *Fordham University* and JOHN F. BURNS, *Villanova College*

This new basic text for the medieval history course has been called by reviewers—"A book that gets down to essentials". They also say—"The careful plan of the work . . . its division into five sections (The Roman World, The Teutonic World, The Christian World, The Feudal World, The Changing World) makes for discernment and clarity."

The excellent style of the two authors, their frequent use of source material, and the critical, constructive point of view which they bring to their treatment make it a stimulating as well as informative book for the classroom.

770 pages, illustrated, maps \$4.00

### History for Wartime Courses

AMERICAN POLITICAL and SOCIAL HISTORY  
Third Edition H. U. Faulkner

The most widely used of the one volume college texts. This new edition carries the story through the meeting at Casablanca.

814 pages, ill., maps, \$3.85

WORKBOOK IN AMERICAN HISTORY

171 pages \$1.10

Biese

DOCUMENTS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

Third Edition

Commager

1100 pages \$4.00

EUROPE SINCE 1914

Fifth Edition

F. Lee Bennis

Excellent to give an understanding of the broad political, economic, and social factors of the present world conflict.

998 pages, ill., maps, \$3.75

EUROPEAN HISTORY SINCE 1870

Second Edition

F. Lee Bennis

Fulfills the objectives of the above and provides a broader treatment of the background of the First World War.

1061 pages, ill., maps, \$4.50

Write for detailed analyses of these books for wartime courses

101 Fifth Avenue

F. S. CROFTS & CO.

New York